

University of Montana

ScholarWorks at University of Montana

Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, &
Professional Papers

Graduate School

1978

Effects of communication skills training on the accuracy of interpersonal perception and important interpersonal relationships

John Anthony Cote
The University of Montana

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd>

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Cote, John Anthony, "Effects of communication skills training on the accuracy of interpersonal perception and important interpersonal relationships" (1978). *Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers*. 4897.
<https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd/4897>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.

THE EFFECTS OF COMMUNICATION SKILLS TRAINING
ON THE ACCURACY OF INTERPERSONAL
PERCEPTION, AND IMPORTANT
INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

by

John A. Cote

B.A., University of Montana 1973

Presented in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA

1978

Approved by:

William W. Wilms
Chairman, Board of Examiners

R. C. Murray
Dean, Graduate School

6-2-78
Date

UMI Number: EP40361

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP40361

Published by ProQuest LLC (2014). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

6-8-78

ABSTRACT

Cote, John A., M.A., 1978

Interpersonal Communication

The Effects of Communication Skills Training on the Accuracy of Interpersonal Perception, and Important Interpersonal Relationships

Director: William W. Wilmot

WWW

The purpose of the study was to examine the effects of communication skills training (Interpersonal Communication 110 at the University of Montana) on the accuracy of interpersonal perception and important interpersonal relationships.

Two groups of students and their friends were utilized as subjects in a quasi-experimental design which prevented the experimenter from randomly assigning subjects to experimental and control conditions, or randomly assigning conditions to the groups.

Pretests and posttests on the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (BLRI) were administered to the significant others of students in both the experimental (Interpersonal Communication 110) and control (Interpersonal Communication 111) conditions. These scores were utilized using an analysis of covariance technique to determine if any significant changes occurred as a result of training. Pretests and posttests on an experimenter modified version of the BLRI were administered to all experimental and control students. This experimenter modified BLRI directed subjects to predict how their significant other perceived the subject's attitudes and behaviors in their interpersonal relationship with the significant others. These were then correlated with the significant other's BLRI pretests and posttests to assess the accuracy of interpersonal perception of the experimental and control subjects on both the pre and posttests.

Results indicated that only one of the six hypothesized improvements in the importance of the relationship occurred. This was on the Level of Regard scale of the BLRI, which was significantly improved at the time of posttesting for the experimental group.

No hypothesized improvement in the accuracy of interpersonal perception occurred. Experimental subjects however had larger correlations than the controls on all of the 12 correlations in the pretest and posttest.

Students in the experimental group were found to be significantly better in accuracy in interpersonal perception at the very outset of the study however, and their interpersonal relationships with their significant others was significantly better than those of the controls at the start of the study. It was evident that the two groups did not represent the same population. The failure to obtain significant results at the time of posttesting was no doubt due to ceiling effects and statistical regression.

Directions for future, more valuable research were suggested.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
CHAPTER	
I. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	1
Purpose of the Study	1
Hypotheses to be Tested	3
Conceptual and Operational Definitions of the Variables	4
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	8
History and Background of Encounter	10
The Independent Variable	12
Outcomes of Encounter	14
Interpretations of the Outcomes of Encounter . .	16
Perception and Group Research	18
Methodological Considerations for Group Research	22
Person Perception	25
Background of Perceptual Research	26
Development of the Person Perception Method . .	28
Critique of the Person Perception Method	30
Other Problems in the Area of Perception	32
Recent Developments in Theory and Research . . .	36
Coorientation and System Theory	39

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

CHAPTER	Page
Systems and Coorientation	40
The Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory . . .	43
Description of the BLRI Scales	44
The Experimenter Modified Relationship Inventory	48
Summary	50
III. METHOD.	52
Subjects	52
Experimental Design	53
Materials	53
Procedure	54
Statistical Treatment of Data	56
IV. RESULTS	58
Covariance and Correlational Results	58
Additional Treatment of Data	66
V. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	69
Methodological Problems	71
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	80
Appendix 1: Interpersonal Communication 110 Activities . .	88
Appendix 2: Interpersonal Communication 111 Activities . .	98
Appendix 3: Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventories . . .	101
Appendix 4: Experimenter Modified Relationship Inventories	111
Appendix 5: Other Materials	122

CHAPTER I

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of a modified encounter group (Interpersonal Communication 110 at the University of Montana) on the accuracy of interpersonal perception and important interpersonal relationships.

Research in the area of encounter groups, sensitivity training and T group training is growing yearly (Gibb, 1974), and many of the methodological problems which plagued the earliest work have begun to be solved (Smith, 1975a). Yet one of the most important aspects of encounter group and sensitivity training has yet to be successfully attacked. As Smith (1975a) notes, inherent in the name sensitivity training is the assumption that by providing people with training, they will become more sensitive to themselves and to others. Do sensitivity training, and encounter group training actually make people more sensitive? Does it improve their perceptual abilities? Smith states "Studies which validly test for more precise changes such as increased accuracy of perception of others, are still not available." (p. 610). The fact is, we simply do not know how encounter group experience effects the accuracy of interpersonal perception.

Research by others (Burke and Bennis, 1961; Danish, 1971; Foulds, 1973; Foulds, Girona, and Guinan, 1970; Gassner, Gold, Snadowsky, and Blekin, 1964; Grater, 1959; Harrison, 1962, Hewitt and Kraft, 1973; Hofstede, 1975; and Snadowsky and Belkin 1974) tends to indicate that people's perceptual attitudes of other persons, either inside of the group itself, or outside the group are changed by sensitivity or encounter group training. They do not agree on the direction of change. Most sources found that others are perceived more positively while other studies found them perceived less positively. Group training does then effect peoples affective states concerning other people. But whether the changes are due to greater accuracy on the part of the participants or not, again we do not know.

A second and related question deals with the effect of group experience on the important interpersonal relationships that a person has before entering into the group situation. Lee (1969), and Bunker (1965) have both looked into this area and have found significant changes in relationships outside of the group experience. Bunkers' findings relate to co-workers and Lees' relate to roommates. These two studies both suggest that there is a positive effect of group experience on outside relationships. Smith (1976a), in his review of controlled studies did not however find a single study which met his criteria for control and duration of timing, which addressed the question. Also, the considerations relating to demand characteristics which can effect

any experiment in the social sciences as suggested by Adair (1973) must be considered, because the co-workers and roommates of Lees' and Bunkers' subjects were fully aware that these people had participated in the experience, and that some changes might in fact occur for that reason alone.

It is the intent of this study to begin the process of developing a method to objectively measure accuracy of interpersonal perception, and the quality of interpersonal relationships as they are affected by the process of encounter group training. This method must include communication research, a coorientational perspective, and must integrate several components of the broad literature and theory of person perception.

Hypotheses to be Tested

On the basis of research already noted, as well as that to be presented in Chapter II: A Review of Related Literature, the following hypotheses can be stated.

- H₁: The interpersonal relationships of experimental subjects will improve significantly compared to the interpersonal relationships of controls, as measured by the six scales of the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory filled out by the subjects significant others.

- H₂: The interpersonal perception of the experimental subjects will improve significantly compared to the interpersonal perception of the control group subjects as measured by correlating the subjects scores on the Modified Barrett-Lennard Relationship inventory, with the Relationship Inventories filled out by their significant others.

Conceptual and Operational Definitions of Variables

The independent variable in this study is a modified encounter group, Interpersonal Communication 110, Introduction to Human Communication Relationships. The class was taught by Dr. Leslie Baxter, Barbara Bender, and John Cote spring quarter, 1976, at the University of Montana. Interpersonal Communication 110 consists of a number of exercises, and group experiences designed to help people become more congruent in their communication behavior, and better understand themselves as well as other people. As in all group situations, no two groups are alike, even if the basic content of the groups are. Since people in the groups are individuals, and therefore react differently to stimuli, it is safe to assume as well that every group experience will be different for every individual who participates in it. To facilitate the process of examining the nature of the independent variable, Appendix 1, with examples of daily class activities done in each of the three sections has been included. This provides the reader an opportunity to examine the similarities and differences between the different group experiences.

There are two dependent variables in this study. First, is accuracy of interpersonal perception, and second, is improvement in interpersonal relationships.

Accuracy of interpersonal perception was defined as the agreement between the subject and the significant other on the significant other's perception of the subject in their relationships. This was assessed by correlating the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (BLRI) filled out by the significant others, with the Modified Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventories filled out by the subjects.

Improvement in interpersonal relationships was defined as the degree to which the BLRI scales on the pretest are lower for the significant others, than they are at the posttest. Thus, the higher the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory scale, the greater the quality of the relationship.

The Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory is the measure developed by G. T. Barrett-Lennard (1962) which consists of five scales designed to measure some of the components that Rogers (1957) considered to be necessary for therapeutic change. These five scales are: Empathy, Level of Regard, Unconditionality of Regard, Congruence, and willingness to be known. In some cases, the sum total of these five scales has been utilized as a sixth, or global measure of the quality of a relationship. This was also the case in this study. (See Appendix 3).

Empathy may be defined as the extent to which a person is conscious of the immediate awareness of another person. Empathy here is a specific trait which refers to the ability of the subject to understand the perceived feelings of the significant other. The term Empathy is often used in person perception research as a general trait. That is not its meaning here.

Level of Regard may be defined as the value of feelings in a relationship. This value may be either positive or negative. It refers to the significant other's perception of the subject in their relationship.

Unconditionality of Regard may be defined as the extent to which a person's regard for another is consistent in the relationship. That is, the person's regard is always positive, or always negative, and that it doesn't vary considerably because it is not dependent upon the behavior of the other person in the relationship. In this study, it refers to the significant other's perception of the subject in their relationship.

Congruence may be defined as the extent to which a person in a relationship is consistent in his feelings and behaviors. If a person feels frustration, he will communicate that frustration, the same being true of other feelings and behaviors. In this study, congruence refers to the feelings and behaviors of the subjects as perceived by the significant others in their relationship.

Willingness to Be Known is the degree to which one person is willing to discuss himself with another person. This area relates very closely with the research on self-disclosure (see for example the work of Cozby, 1973, Jourard, 1968, or Jourard, 1971). In this study it will refer to the perception of the significant other of the subject's behavior in their relationship.

The experimenter Modified Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory is the measure that will be completed by the subjects in the study. It corresponds directly with the Barrett-Lennard filled out by the subject's significant others. It consists of the same six scales, Level of Regard, Empathy, Congruence, Unconditionality of Regard, and Willingness to Be Known, and the total scale. Each item however refers to the significant other's perception of the attitudes and skills of the person filling out the modified measure (See Appendix 4).

Interpersonal Perception can be defined as the agreement between the subject and his significant other on the subjects view of the significant other's perception of the attitudes and skills of the subject. The higher the correlation between the measures filled out by these two people, the better the perception of the subject.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

History and Background of Encounter

Encounter groups, like other social groups exist to help people solve problems. Groups of one kind or another have existed since time began, but encounter is a new development that had much of its impetus in the late 1940's with the National Training Laboratory (NTL) at Bethel, Maine.

The first forerunner of the T-Group (Training Group) was a special conference for adult education called by Leland Bradford in 1946. Attending were such notable persons as Kurt Lewin, and Kenneth Benne. Using an unobtrusive measurement technique (stationing men and women in the restrooms between meetings) Bradford found that people did not talk about material from the conference lectures, but did talk about their small work groups (Bradford, 1967). The researchers, Bradford, Lippitt, Benne, and Lewin were holding feedback sessions with the remaining members of the research staff when conference participants asked to attend. The feedback they received excited them more than anything they had done to that time, and following the conference Bradford, and Benne talked with Lewin about doing the same thing on a national level.

The first NTL T-Group was held in 1947, using the basic information learned in 1946, in conjunction with the Research Center for Group Dynamics, run by Lewin at MIT. Over the years, NTL had modified its groups, and extended its activities into the NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science (Bradford, 1967).

Simultaneously with the NTL Developments, Rogers (1970), and his associates at the University of Chicago Counseling Center began training masters degree candidates in intensive group settings in an effort to prepare them for the problems faced by the GI's returning from World War II. Rogers noted, "It provided many deep and meaningful experience for the trainees, and was so successful in a sequence of groups of personal counselors that our staff continued to use the procedure in summer workshops thereafter". (p. 4).

Since these early beginnings at NTL and the University of Chicago, group procedures and emphasis have spread in many directions. Group settings are available today almost anywhere in the nation. Synanon, Alanon, Human Relations Training, Sensitivity training, Sensory awareness, Gestalt groups, T-Groups, and basic encounter groups have all evolved in the past 30 years.

Much of the earliest data and indeed much recent literature as well, related to encounter groups is of a testimonial nature (Diamond and Shapiro, 1975). People speaking out about how groups have changed their lives for the better or for the worst. Gibb (1974), points out that before 1965, only 54 studies had been done on the effects of

group training, while by 1972, the number had risen to 336, and it is safe to assume that that number is steadily growing.

Definitions and Assumptions

With all the diversity in group types, a standard definition of the nature of sensitivity training is becoming harder to arrive at all of the time. Smith (1975a) in an effort to do so states the following three points.

It is a "process which (a) occurs in small groups, (b) involves the examination of interpersonal relations among members of each group, and (c) extends its membership to include those not undergoing psychotherapy.
(p. 597)

The problem with Smith's definition is that each of its parts require further definition themselves. How small (or large) is a "small" group? In what ways do people examine their interpersonal relations? How does one define the term psychotherapy?

By viewing the above definition, it is difficult if not impossible to understand the process of encounter. Perhaps an easier way is to examine some of the common threads which Rogers sees as consistent across group types.

"A facilitator can develop, in a group which meets intensively, a psychological climate of safety in which freedom of expression and reduction of defensiveness gradually occur.

"In such a psychological climate many of the immediate feeling reactions of each member toward others, and of each member toward himself, tend to be expressed.

"A climate of mutual trust develops out of this mutual freedom to express real feelings, positive and negative. Each member moves toward greater acceptance of his total being--emotional, intellectual, and physical--as it is, including its potential.

"With individuals less inhibited by defensive rigidity, the possibility of change in personal attitudes and behavior, in professional methods, in administrative procedures and relationships becomes less threatening.

"With the reduction of defensive rigidity, individuals can hear each other, can learn from each other, to a greater extent.

"There is a development of feedback from one person to another, such that each individual learns how he appears to others and what impact he has in interpersonal relationships.

"With this greater freedom and improved communication, new ideas, new concepts, new directions emerge. Innovation can become a desirable rather than threatening possibility.

"These learnings in the group experience tend to carry over, temporarily or more permanently, into the relationships with spouse, children, students, subordinates, peers, and even superiors following the group experience".

(p. 7-8)

Campbell and Dunnette (1968) also state 8 major assumptions about the group process, but they are not the same as those of Rogers, though there are of course several similarities. Campbell and Dunnette offer these assumptions:

"1. A substantial number of group members when confronted with others' behaviors and feelings in an atmosphere of psychological safety, can produce articulate and constructive feedback.

"2. A significant number of group members can agree on the major aspects of a particular individual's behavior exhibited in the group situation. Certainly a complete consensus is not to be expected, but neither must the feedback go off in all directions. A certain degree of commonality is necessary if the feedback is to be helpful for the individual.

"3. Feedback is relatively complete and deals with significant aspects of the individual's behavior.

"4. The behavior emitted in the group is sufficiently representative of behavior outside the group so that learning occurring within the group will carry over or transfer.

"5. Psychological safety can be achieved relatively quickly (in a matter of a few hours) among either complete strangers or among associates who have had varying types and degrees of interpersonal interaction.

"6. Almost everyone initially lacks interpersonal competence; that is, individuals tend to have distorted self-images, faulty perceptions, and poor communication skills.

"7. Anxiety facilitates new learning.

"8. Finally, transfer for training occurs between the cultural island and the "back home" situation".

(p. 77)

Taken as a whole, these assumptions of Rogers, and Campbell and Dunnette will probably satisfy most if not all of the persons involved in the process of providing encounter group, and sensitivity types of experiences.

The Independent Variable

The ways in which these assumptions and common threads are implemented within the group differs greatly. Encounter techniques vary from nude encounters and marathon groups to highly structures and

tightly organized group experiences like those found in Structured Experiences by Pfeiffer and Jones (1969, 1970, 1971, 1972).

As is obvious by now, the inability of researchers, and group trainers to distinctly define encounter, or the process it consists of is the greatest single problem facing experimental research in this area. Since the individual nature of groups seems to defy definition, it also prevents adequate specification of the encounter group, T-Group or sensitivity training as an independent variable. Gibb (1974), in his review of the experimental literature discusses the extremely wide range of differences in one simple aspect of the group experience, the amount of time involved in the training process. Some group sessions he stated were as short as 5 minutes (!), while some marathon sessions lasted over 30 hours. Not only does the duration of individual sessions vary considerably, total training time for groups stretches from an hour or less, to 60 hours or more. The settings of group meetings also vary considerable. Some are residential settings where people are away from home and business, as at NTL at Bethel, Maine, or Esalen in California. Others are established and conducted in the business organization itself. Still other groups are operated within schools and universities across the country.

Not only are there vast differences in setting, session length, and total time of training, what happens in individual sessions varies as much, or more. Many researchers and authors (Cooper, 1975; Gibb, 1974; Lieberman, 1975; Lieberman, Yalom and Miles, 1973; Miles, 1975;

Ross, Kligfeld, and Whitman, 1971; Rowan, 1975; Schutz, 1975; Smith, 1975b; and Yalom and Lieberman, 1971) who have studied casualties of group experiences suggest that a major factor involved is the style of individual trainer. His (or her) behaviors will be a major factor determining whether the effects of a group will be positive or negative on the group participants.

With so much diversity in group types, it is little wonder that research on group outcomes have been so varied. Experimenters have created a new black box. They measure what goes in, measure what comes out, but seldom specify the independent variable which is assumed to cause changes between pre and post measures.

In the present study, an attempt was made to better identify the independent variable. Appendix 1 contains a list of activities for each of the sections of Interpersonal Communication 110, used for the study. Each class met six hours per week (three sessions of two hours each) for ten weeks. Because of scheduling and holidays, each group met for twenty-seven sessions, for a total of 54 hours.

Outcomes of Encounter

In their 1968 review of the literature, Campbell and Dunnette developed a list of six major desired outcomes, or goals of the encounter process. They will be quoted in part because they are the best statement available to date.

"1. Increased self-insight or self-awareness concerning one's own behavior and its meaning in a social context.

"2. Increased sensitivity to the behavior of others. This goal is closely linked with the above. It refers first to the development of an increased awareness of the full range of communicative stimuli emitted by other persons (voice inflections, facial expressions, bodily positions, and other contextual factors, in addition to the actual choice of words) and second, to the development of the ability to infer accurately the emotional or non-cognitive basis for interpersonal communications. This goal is very similar to the concept of empathy as it is used by clinical and counseling psychologists, that is the ability to infer correctly what another person is feeling.

"3. Increased awareness and understanding of the types of processes that facilitate or inhibit group functioning and the interactions between different groups...

"4. Heightened diagnostic skill in social, interpersonal, and intergroup situations.

"5. Increased action skill.

"6. Learning how to learn. This does not refer to an individual's cognitive approach to the world, but rather to his ability to analyze continually his own interpersonal behavior for the purpose of helping himself and others achieve more effective and satisfying interpersonal relationships."

Since the goals stated above are extremely broad, and lacking in concreteness, it is very difficult to operationalize and measure their attainment as a result of the group experience.

Gibb (1974) reports that,

"more than 300 different dependent variable measures were used in studies I examined. The results can only be summarized here. Investigators report statistically significant increases in such variables as risk taking, expressed warmth and caring, empathy, internal control, self esteem, congruence in self and

ideal-concept, interpersonal sensitivity, problem solving skills, expressiveness, trust, spontaneity, democratic behavior, number of innovations, genuineness, etc. Statistically significant decreases are reported in such variables as feelings of anxiety, rigidity, racial prejudice, discomfort with feelings, dogmatism, and alienation.

"The results however are by no means always statistically significant. Self acceptance for instance was measured as a dependent variable in 41 studies, showing positive changes in 21, and no change in 20".

(p. 156)

Out of the 100 controlled studies examined by Smith (1975a), 78 had positive outcomes. In 31 more which did follow ups, at one month or more, following the group experience, 21 showed statistically significant differences between experimental and control subjects.

Interpretation of the Outcomes of Encounter

With the broad diversity in group types, and the wide range of variables examined, it is easy to understand how individual group studies, as well as the vast literature is difficult if not impossible to interpret. Further, the nature of the data, in most cases being found from self report personality questionnaires, and experimenter designed semantic differential and Q sort techniques increases the difficulty. Very few studies have ever attempted to obtain an objective behavioral measure, and those that have, also face interpretation problems.

The major reason for these problems is the fact that theoretical developments in research and training have not kept pace with the social development of encounter as a medium in education, business,

institutional, and therapeutic care settings. This lack of theory allows experimenters to claim positive results, regardless of the change, and in fact, in some instances when there is in fact no change at all. Bunker (1965) and Boyd and Ellis (1962) make this claim and with some validity, since much of the learning that takes place in the group atmosphere is based on the needs of the individuals involved. As a whole, the individuals need changes in different directions. Thus, shifts by individuals in both directions will cancel each other out. Harrison (1971), suggests that it is not impossible for subjects to make positive significant shifts on both self-control and spontaneity, which are generally considered polar opposites.

One of the reasons this slight of hand trick is possible is that using self report data, changes in either direction following the group experience can be seen as positive. Harrison (1971), for example suggests that the process of change itself can lead to

"greater variability and inconsistency in values; and perceptions; and a higher level of aspiration for the quality of interpersonal relationships. These might well be accompanied by higher levels of anxiety and discomfort around the individual's self concept and his interpersonal relationships".
(p. 76).

Cooper (1975), suggests that poorer scores on a self concept measure, or personality scale might not be poorer at all. The intent of self concept scales, is after all usually apparent. A person who feels very threatened by a poor self concept is probably not going to fill out that scale accurately. Since one of the common threads

running through group work is self acceptance, a lower score on a personality or self concept scale after a group experience may simply measure greater self acceptance, and "willingness to admit more psychologically threatening material to one's consciousness". (p. 251).

Amith (1975b) suggests that one of the behavioral measures used by those attempting to show adverse effects in encounter group training is also uninterpretable, for much the same reason. If seeking professional counseling, or other assistance is the behavioral measure, such action again may be self acceptance of the need for that professional assistance. Likewise, with more and more people entering professional relationships, not because of emergency problems, but because of a desire to take advantage of this means of personal growth, a person may actually be demonstrating greater health and a desire for self actualization.

Perception and Group Research

As pointed out by Smith (1975a) and Campbell and Dunnette (1968), even though accuracy of interpersonal perception is a crucial issue in group training, little work has been done on this area to date.

Campbell and Dunnette state:

"T-Group advocates forcefully call attention to the important role played by interpersonal perception in getting to know and learning to work constructively with other people. They make it the key to developing mature and understanding interaction in nearly all human relationships. As a consequence, the central focus of T-Group training is to increase the level of accuracy

with which persons discern the attributes, attitudes, opinions, feelings, and reactions of others in their social and work environments".

(p. 79)

Yet they add "So far most investigators have not attempted to cope with the serious measurement and design problems inherent in this area". (p. 80).

Smith (1975a) using a strong criteria of adequate control, and 20 hours minimum of group training did not find a single study which even tested to see if group participants did in fact perceive other persons more accurately.

As is evident from the comments of the reviewers, there is little valuable literature within individual group experiments relating to the question at hand. However, perception is such an important area, several studies that deal with affective perception will be discussed.

Foulds (1970, 1973), Foulds, Firona and Guinan (1970), and Foulds, Guinan, and Wareheim (1974), working with college students in gestalt oriented marathon and weekly groups produced significant positive changes in affective sensitivity scales toward self and others. They also found significant differences on the POI (Personal Orientation Inventory). Grater (1959), also found positive and significant attitude shifts toward self and others, but did not control for other factors. Gassner, Gold, and Snadowsky (1964), conducted three different studies on T-Group participants from City College of New York. While they found significant changes between self and ideal self, self and

other attitudes for the experimental group, control subjects demonstrated equally significant changes and the difference between experimental and control subjects was insignificant. Significant differences between experimental and control subjects appeared only in the third study, where the measure related to democratic styles of leadership.

The studies mentioned above show significant, and insignificant changes in attitudes toward self and others as a result of group experience. Harrison (1962), and Hofstede (1975) contradict this work, and qualify it greatly. In Harrison's work, attitudes toward other members of the group did improve as a result of training, however, attitudes toward others not present in the group showed a decline after training. Hofstede, working with managers in a residential setting in Switzerland found that after a three day personal managerial feedback group, managers showed a significant non-hypothesized shift in attitude away from their bosses. Examining this and other data, he postulated what he referred to as the "cold shower effect", that faces persons when they return to the everyday world away from the "safe" atmosphere of the T-Group. Again, no clear cut conclusions about group outcomes presents itself.

A highly relevant study germane to one of the questions at hand is that of Bunker (1965). The main reason Bunker's work takes on this importance is that Bunker instead of asking his trainees if they had changed as a result of the group experience, asked the trainees,

(and a matched control group's) coworkers if they perceived any changes in the trainees behavior. Bunkers work is one of the first to see if group experience and learning actually does generalize from the group setting to the everyday world outside of the group experience. Second, and what is more important to the present research, Bunker's data is not self report provided by the group participants, but hopefully "objective" observations by people with whom he interacts daily. The results of Bunker's study were quite clear. Experimental group subjects changed significantly more than matched controls. Some of the areas where these changes occurred were: receiving communication, relational facility, increased interdependence, self control, awareness of behavior, sensitivity to group process, sensitivity to others, acceptance of others, tolerance of new information, comfort, and insight into self and role. The only possible problems with Bunker's work will be discussed in the next section on methodological considerations for group research.

Of the group research available only three studies deal with the question of improved accuracy. The earliest was done by Burke and Bennis (1961). Of five predicted results, the one of crucial importance to this study was that over time, the amount of variation in raters ratings of other group members would decrease. This would be due to two factors. First, as individuals received more feedback from others, their behavior in the group should become more consistent. Second, and more important, if people are becoming more accurate perceivers,

the variability in their perception should also decrease. Of five predicted results, only this one was not significant. There was no proof that people did infact improve in accuracy of perception as a result of the T-Group experience.

The remaining two studies deal with the changes in the accuracy of perception as a result of group training, however, neither met the criteria of Smith (1975a), since both were uncontrolled. The first is by Danish (1971) who used Form C of the Affective Sensitivity Scale in an attempt to obtain objective data on the accuracy question. In five groups, with 10 members each, Danish was unable to find any significant differences between pretests and posttests of the group participants. In the second study, Danish and Kagen (1971), again used the Affective Sensitivity Scale with 51 group subjects divided into six smaller groups. Two of the smaller groups did obtain significantly higher sensitivity scores, and the six groups when collapsed into a single group were also significantly improved from the pretest. The experimenters could not identify any trainer, or group characteristics that would lead to the differential performance of their groups.

Methodological Considerations For Group Research

As mentioned in the previous section, there have been some critiques of Bunker's (1965) work. The major ones are methodological. The most important of these is his method of collecting information. Though he had an excellent idea to work with coworkers of his T-Group participants and control, there was no way to control for demand characteristics

that would enter into the research. All of the coworkers knew who had, and who had not attended the T-Group, they were aware that T-Groups are supposed to change a person's organizational effectiveness, and as a result, they may have assumed the person had changed when in fact there was little difference in his actual behavior. Still another, and more practical explanation is that since people were expecting change from T-Group participants, they were probably looking for changes. Thus, even slight changes, or simply more careful observation of already established behavior patterns would lead observers to assume some change had indeed occurred. It is also possible of course that because the coworkers expected change, they behaved differently than they did before the group, with the participant. These changes could have caused changes in the participants, that were then attributed to the group experience. As Thomas (1928) so aptly explained this sort of situation, "If men define situations as real, they are real in their consequences."

The reverse of this explanation could then be seen as an adequate explanation of why control subjects did not change. For them, there were no demand characteristics, no belief they had, or would, or perhaps even should change. They had not undergone the T-Group experience, and so should not be different.

The only way that Bunker could have controlled for these effects would have been to obtain some measure prior to the T-Group experience with which he could compare the post T-Group results. But again,

some demand characteristics could foul his data. If for example he had gathered pretest data, he would have made the coworkers more sensitive to the established behavior patterns of the subjects and coworkers. Again, because of the established beliefs of the coworkers, that changes would result from the group, a Hawthorne type effect could ensue, with the coworkers seeing any change as a positive move toward greater organizational effectiveness. Again, Thomas' explanation holds.

In order to avoid these, and other important methodological concerns, it is necessary to heed the advice of reviewers like Harrison (1971) and Diamond and Shapiro (1975). Both studies make many valid suggestions for gathering data relevant to encounter groups. Another important consideration is adequate specification of the independent variable, the nature of the encounter, or T-Group that the subjects experience. In an attempt to meet this suggestion, complete class activity lists are included for each of the three sections of INCO 110 in Appendix I., to make replication, and/or understanding of the independent variable possible.

Diamond and Shapiro (1975, p. 60) list several methodological flaws in previous research, some of which are addressed in this study. First, there is an attempt to obtain an adequate base rate for the experimental and control groups. Second, observers in this study are completely independent of the experimenter. Third, the measure used

a quantitative, and highly consistent with the goals of the group.

Fourth, adequate statistical analyses are performed on the data.

One further concern of Harrison (1971) has also been considered, and that pertains to data collection itself. Harrison in discussing the timing of data collection noted that the first session or two of a group can be an anxious time for both the facilitators, and participants. Data collection at this time, therefore "affects direction and variability of responses to many kinds of instruments". (p. 81).

Also, collecting data the final day of the group when people feel the full "glow" can have biasing effects on the obtained results as well.

Person Perception

"As the very least, we need concepts which indicate both the interaction and interexperience of two persons, and help us to understand the relation between each person's own experiences and his own behavior, always, of course within the context of the relationship between them. Our concepts must also help us to understand the persons and their relations in relation to the system which their relationship creates". (Laing, Phillipson, and Lee, 1966, p. 7).

In this short paragraph, Laing et.al., have stated all of the most important considerations facing people doing research in the social sciences. First, people do not live in vacuums, and their behaviors effect those around them, as well as themselves. Second, they bring up the question of how a person's past experiences effect his present behavior. This is where the process of perception comes into the picture. And third, is that this picture is the system that exists because two or more individuals are in psychological contact.

No one would argue with the statement that perception is both cause and effect of behavior. All the information that any individual can act on is received by one or more of the 5 senses. Thus, any effort to predict human behavior must start at a careful evaluation of that person's perceptual field. This desire to predict behavior is the key to psychology as a scientific enterprise. If we did not assume that human behavior was lawful, more than a random selection of movements or acts, we would be unable to function in any social context. By perceiving another person, inferring his or her feelings from the context, we can predict, with varying degrees of accuracy, their future behaviors. Because of this central role of perception to social functioning, psychologists, and other behavioral scientists have often attempted to determine the nature of perception, and how it effects both the perceiver, and the perceived.

As mentioned in the previous section, very little work done in encounter group settings have studied this important area. As a result, little is known of the role of perception in the group process, or the effect of the group process on future perceptions. Thus, a review of the literature pertaining to the area of person perception and more recent theoretical and methodological innovations is called for since it will assist in understanding the present work.

Background of Perceptual Research

The historical and philosophical antecedents of person perception research has been well researched and presented (Bronfenbrenner,

Harding, and Gallwey, 1958; Hastorf, Schneider, and Polefka, 1970; McLeod and Chaffee, 1973; and Taiguri, 1969). No further discussion of this area is needed, save mention of the rich interdisciplinary nature of its roots. Such philosophers as Freuerback, sociologists of the stature of Thomas, Mead, Cooley and Cottrell, and psychologists like Allport, Sullivan, Newcomb, and Boring have all addressed the area at one time or another.

Until recently, the major thrust of work in the area was toward isolating and describing the phenomenon; perceptual ability. Perceptual ability was believed to be a trait, either general, specific, or both, and like motives, needs, and attitudes was considered to be characteristic of the individual (McLeod and Chaffee, 1973). Such intrapersonal qualities were believed by many to be the causes of behavior. Yet even such early researchers as Vernon (1933), were aware that the "whole field of social relations is too complex either to be summed up in a few stereotyped names such as insight, intuition, social intelligence, social perception, etc. or to be covered by narrow categories of psychometric tests". (p. 55).

The earliest experimental work in the area related to the recognition of emotion, based on the early works of Darwin toward the end of the 19th century. The methodology for this research consisted usually of showing subjects either drawings or photographs, and then asking them to identify the emotion felt by the person portrayed. Later, work had subjects rate individual's intelligence, artistic

ability, and social characteristics by examining the photographs of the individuals to be rated. Other traits to be rated included such things as sense of humor, social techniques, introversion-extraversion, projective psychological inventory characteristics, and personality inventory characteristics. (For additional availables, see Vernon, 1933, p. 52).

Development of the Person Perception Method

In two studies published in 1949, and 1950, Dymond developed a method which was to have a determining effect on much research until the middle and late 1950's. Dymond's work was in many ways a direct result of Cottrell, and his call to the American Sociological Association for more research in the area of empathetic ability. The heart of Dymond's method was requiring her subjects to predict the responses of other subjects on six different personality traits. She had two predictive measures, first, she asked each subject to predict how the other person would rate himself on the six traits. Second, she had each subject predict the other person's rating of the subject. The subject's response was then subtracted from the other persons responses. The larger the score, the poorer the measured perception.

The predictive method was immediately picked up by researchers across the field. Bronfenbrenner, Harding, and Gallwey (1958) discuss the adoption of the method and its initial acceptance.

"Such a technique has a number of advantages. It is easy to administer. It is 'objective': It requires no subjective judgment by the experimenter, the results can be expressed in quantitative terms, and, above all, it all has kind of literal 'face validity' which it seems almost presumptuous to question. We are interested in A's ability to predict the responses of B; what can be a more appropriate index of this ability than the error which A makes when asked to estimate a series of responses of B? Virtually every investigator, whether he speaks in terms of 'empathy', 'social insight', 'understanding', or 'ability to judge' proposes this same operational definition. With this almost universal agreement, problems of theoretical assumptions and possible conceptual distinctions have receded into the background. The obvious task has been to gather data and analyze the results." (p. 33).

Much of the work done from that time, indeed up to the late 1950's attempted to find the trait that had illuded other researchers. However, some of the research done as soon as two to three years after the development of the method began to find problems using a single accuracy score in rating subjects empathetic ability. Hastorf and Bender (1952), for example, suggested that there were two factors in predictive scores, one, projective, or the judge attributing his own feelings to the person rated, the other factor they referred to as empathetic ability, being more objective, cognitive, and truly perceptive. Gage (1953), also discussed the problems researchers were having developing a theory that would help explain problems that were arising in explaining the results of the predictive studies. Gage, like Hastorf and Bender, believed there were two types of accuracy scores, these he referred to as "Accuracy in perceiving manifest

stimulus value and accuracy in taking the role of the other". (p. 141). He also noted that there was a stereotype response set that could produce fairly high accuracy scores, even when the subjects had not seen the experimental stimulus. Wittich (1955), found that predictability in some situations (military work groups with daily contact for at least four months) could be considered a trait. He also found however, that the capacity to be predicted by another individual was also a trait. Last, he found that there was a positive relationship between the adjustment (as measured by a shortened version of the Bell Adjustment Inventory) of the subject and the ability of others to predict his responses.

Thus, by 1955, many people doing research in the field found many and highly varied results using the method developed by Dymond. Scores were said to be effected by projection, actual empathetic ability, stereotyped response sets, the ability to predicted stimulus to be predicted, and the psychological adjustment of the predicted individual. With so many factors effecting the research it was only a matter of time before a methodological critique would appear.

Critique of the Person Perception Method

The first major critique of the person perception research was published by Cronbach in 1955. Cronbach, like the others before him who attempted to explain differing results in isolating a trait of empathetic ability suggested that obtained measures consisting of heterogeneous

items consist of several components which in many ways do not relate to actual empathetic ability. Cronbach discussed four such major components of the accuracy scores.

First, was evaluation, which considers response styles for individuals filling out either the predictive, or the predicted questionnaire. Cronbach defined it as the "difference between J's control tendency of responding and the central tendency of the self descriptions, for all items and O's combined. (p. 178). The second factor discussed by Cronbach was differential elevation, which again relates to response styles. With differential elevation, we are looking at how the judges average prediction corresponds to the other's central tendency of response. Cronbach agreed that stereotype accuracy is a factor in empathetic ability scores, and defined it in much the same way others had, as the norm for others, or, sensitivity to the generalized other. The final component in Cronbach's analysis was differential accuracy, which he felt was the trait that the experimenters were searching for. He saw it as the "ability to predict differences between O's on any item". (p. 179). Cronbach's major conclusion was that much of the research done to that time was extremely difficult to interpret because it was not a measure of actual empathetic or perceptual ability, but rather a statistical artifact based on "myopic" operationalism which defined empathy as "what empathy tests measure." (p. 177-178).

Cronbach's work is excellent, and it is suggested that if the reader would like more information on these points that he refer to the work in its entirety, or that done by Cronbach in 1958 for it is rich in methodological critiques.

By examining the critiques of Cronbach and others (Bronfenbrenner, Harding, and Gallwey 1958; Taiguri, 1969; and Hastorf, Schneider, and Polefka, 1970), it appears that while the work of Dymond was highly heuristic, and it appeared to be parsimonious, methodological problems prevented it from obtaining the potential it was originally believed to have. Yet, the work of Dymond and others on the measurement of empathetic ability, and the critiques of that work led to new ideas about perception in social psychology.

Other Problems in the Area of Perception

Taiguri (1969), states: "Person perception refers to the processes by which man comes to know and to think about other persons, their characteristics, qualities, and inner states." (p. 395). This statement addresses several problems with regard to the early person perception research that were not addressed even by such thorough critics as Cronbach. The first, and foremost element is the fact that perception of other people is a process. It is not a static element, or trait within the individual that alone determines his behavior. This means, that the individual rather than being a passive receptor of outside stimuli is an active seeker of such stimuli, and that each

individual plays a major role in the interpretation of these stimuli. The second characteristic of perception not addressed by early person perception research is the context in which the perception takes place, i.e., what is the relationship between the perceiver and the perceived. Certainly they were interested in the other person, but only as an objective stimuli, and not as an active dynamic force in the perceptual process.

By presenting judges with drawings, written descriptions, photographs, and motion pictures and extremely short periods of interaction, experimenters, while attempting to define perception had removed it so far from its natural context, that the results could hardly be generalizable to normal interpersonal relations. The problem was, that while the approach was exquisitely simple, the problem was exquisitely complex.

Perhaps the first and foremost problem in prediction experiments was providing an objective stimulus for people to perceive. The problem here, is that there is always the possibility that what a person says about himself may not agree with his actual behavior in real situations. Stone, Gage, and Leavitt (1957) in their directions to subjects in a prediction study asked them

"How well can you predict how Leo answered these questions? Fill out the questionnaire as you think Leo actually did. This may not necessarily be the same as Leo should have answered if he had told the truth about himself. When there might be a difference between how he did answer, and how he should have answered, you should predict how he did answer".

(p. 247, emphasis added).

These instructions complicate the preceptual predictive task immensely. Not only is the subject required to speculate on Leo's actual behavior in specific situations, he is also instructed to determine the veracity of Leo's statements concerning his own behavior. In a related area, a review of the self disclosure literature by Cozby (1973), showed that there was a chance correlation between expressed self disclosure and actual disclosure in experimental situations. (p. 74). If Leo's self description related to his behavior is like that discussed by Cozby, then asking subjects to predict Leo's responses and not his behavior is a worthless task.

Bronfenbrenner, Harding, and Gallwey (1958), address the same questions, stating:

"In light of the preceding analysis, the limitations of questionnaire responses as criteria become increasing apparent. It is evident that conventional procedures can tap social sensitivity only in so far as such sensitivity is reflected in predictive skill. Moreover, by their very nature such procedures emphasize sensitivity to attitudes and psychological states rather than to overt characteristics or behavior. Except in so far as the questionnaire responses of the person being judged represent accurate descriptions of his own overt acts, the conventional paper-pencil technique does not enable us to appraise the judge's ability in recognizing whether other people actually behave in an influential or submissive manner, etc.; what we appraise is the judge's sensitivity to whether or not another person regards himself as having behaved in a particular fashion. In terms of the distinctions we have introduced, the questionnaire method focuses on recognition of experimental aspects as against the physical, actional or characterological. (p. 99).

Hastorf, Schneider, and Polefka also examined the same question and suggest that Dymond's (1949) person perception method is not the only way to obtain a stimulus for person perception research. Other criteria could be established, using peer ratings, clinical judgment, and behavioral patterns. They add, however, that even using alternative criteria for accuracy judgments, there is no certainty that these criteria are superior to self rating on personality inventories, or experimenter designed questionnaires. The problem with clinical judgments is that clinical judgments are made by highly trained professional personnel who make judgments on the basis of subtle cues not available to judges in experimental situations. (Besides Smith 1975b has questioned the predictive ability of even highly trained clinicians. See p. 32). The validity of peer ratings too can cause problems of bias. Friends as well as those who do not care for the subject tend to evaluate either too positively or too negatively (halo effects), and usually have different standard criteria for judging personality dimensions. Behavior patterns are the most accurate measure, but even these have serious drawbacks. First, is the problem of obtaining them. Persons who know they are being observed often behave differently than they do in unobserved situations. Second, is the problem of interpreting the behavior that is observed. Hastorf et. al., conclude that "We could probably get only fair agreement that any given criterion for accuracy is appropriate". (p. 29).

Recent Developments in Theory and Research

After the Cronbach critiques, as well as those of others, most research in the area came to a halt. The problems inherent in the search for a trait approach to perceptual ability led researchers to other more productive approaches to the problem. The most important of these is aimed at looking more carefully at the situation surrounding interpersonal perception, and the process itself, rather than simply attempting to measure differential perceptual abilities of subjects in prediction experiments.

Hastorf, Richardson, and Dornbush (1959), for example call for a pause in the search for the trait of perceptual ability, and suggest that study be made into the kind of categories used by persons in actual interpersonal situations. They suggest that four of the factors that lead to category choice are, first, the situation in which the experience takes place, and the other person or people involved. Second, the importance of the relationship to the persons involved. Third, the behavior of the perceiver in the stated situation. Assuming that perception is both cause and effect of behavior. And, fourth, the effect of immediate prior experiences on the type of perceptual categories used by the individual. McHenry (1971), strengthens this point when he notes:

"If...the 'situationalists' are correct, then to speak of accuracy with regard to the generality of behavior is clearly absurd. accuracy of this sort can hardly exist if generality of behavior is the exception rather than the rule. This is the real failing of

accuracy studies. Almost all of them accept completely traditional trait psychology, the view that individual behavior is caused by characteristics, qualities or processes that exist within persons. Moreover, almost all those who conduct these studies believe that the layman shares and understands this view when he acts as a 'judge' in the typical experimental situation. Both assumptions are probably false." (p. 115).

Work like that of Asch (1946) indicates the importance of perceptual categories on peoples perception. Likewise, as Taiguri (1969), points out in his discussion of research in the area of emotion recognition, people judge others on the basis of situational cues. He notes that showing an individual a grimacing face, and then providing subjects with differing information about the situation where the picture was taken produces highly different results. These situational cues determine what the evaluator believes is the emotion of the person pictured. If the evaluator is told the picture was taken after a hanging, the person will see a grimace as an expression of disgust. If the person is told that the picture was taken as the person in the picture broke the tape in a 100 yard dash, the emotion will be seen as "effort" or "determination". (p. 421).

Theoretical work by Altman and Taylor (1973) on the process of "Social Penetration", is another important aspect of more recent developments in determining the nature of the relationship between persons. Their work with self disclosure, and reciprocity within relationships are valuable concepts for the understanding of perception in established, growing, and decaying relationships.

In the section on development of the person perception method, a study by Wittich (1955), was discussed. Besides Wittich's results, which are significant even when examined in the light of the reviews of Cronbach and others, Wittich's work is important at this point in the review as well since the subjects in Wittich's study had been in close daily contact for a minimum of four months. Compared to film clips (Stone, Gage, and Levitt, 1956) or 90 minutes of small group interaction (Bronfenbrenner, Harding, and Gallwey, 1958), Wittich's study is of great interest because his research was done in established systems, where individuals had had satisfactory opportunities to develop categories to improve their perceptual ability in his experimental situation. It is perhaps not surprising that Wittich found highly significant evidence to support the hypothesis that perceptual ability is in fact a trait, though highly specific, and due to the reciprocity in disclosure as discussed above.

Taguiri (1969), calls for more studies of long term relationships when he says:

"Investigations have been undertaken in which the natural dyadic process of a well-established relationship between persons is used for studying interpersonal perception (see for example Newcomb, 1961; Taguiri, 1958). These however are still relatively rare, and more of them are needed."
(p. 426).

Other areas that are becoming more and more important all the time are the areas of coorientation and the study of the dyadic unit as a system, and the properties that that system has. The importance of

coorientation and systems theory to this study will be the next topic of discussion.

Coorientation and System Theory

Research on communication from a coorientational perspective began in the late 1940's and early 1950's with the publication of articles by Heider (1946) and Newcomb (1953). The major value of the coorientational approach to communication is that the model can lead to predictive statements about the relationship involved.

Coorientational models usually consist of two persons, A, and B, and an object, X. The object can be a person, an issue, or any item which is or could be important in the given dyadic system. There are four relationships of importance existing among these three elements. A's perception of his relationship with B, A's relationship to/with X, B's relationship with A, and B's relationship to/with X. Depending on the valence, (whether the relationships are positive or negative) of these relationships, changes in the relationships can be predicted in a given direction.

Chaffee and McLeod (1968), brought the coorientation model into communication research and as Chaffee (1971) points out, large amounts of work have been done in the area since that time. Much of it, however, he points out is not truly coorientational because it fails to meet certain assumptions. The assumptions he notes are as follows:

- 1a. Person A is simultaneously oriented to person B and to some "object" X.
- 1b. Person B is simultaneously oriented to person A and object X.
2. The elements of X perceived by A are identical to those in B's orientation to X.
3. The cognitive and affective dimensions of judgment of X in A's orientation are identical to those in B's orientation to X.
- 4a. A is oriented toward B, cognitively and affectively..
- 4b. B is oriented toward A, cognitively and affectively.
- 5a. A is oriented to the B-X orientation.
- 5b. B is oriented to the A-X orientation.
- 6a. A sees the B-X orientation as relevant to his B-A and B-X orientations. (p. 3-4).

X in the present study is the relationship between A and B as perceived by each, thus this study is from the basis of a coorientational perspective.

Systems and Coorientation

In order to understand the total complexity of the coorientational model, it is necessary to view the model itself as a system, composed of individual subsystems. Systems have certain characteristics which in many ways govern their existence, growth, and interaction with other systems. Among these are three noted by Wilmot (1975), these are, wholeness (described as interdependence by Newcomb 1960), synergy, and circularity. Wholeness, or interdependence as the terms

suggest, relates to the fact that a change to any part of the system will effect the other parts of the system. A classic example of this principle is the way cosmetic surgery affected the entire self concept of a patient as described by Maltz (1960), in his book Psycho-Cybernetics. The second characteristic is that of synergy. Synergy means the whole of the system is greater than the sum of its parts. This characteristic accounts for such concepts as esprit-de corps, and high moral in the efficient functioning of a system. Circularity, or feedback in a system is the ability of the system to effect itself, which then reverberates through the system. An example for an individual system might be stepping on a scale in the morning, and having the effect (feedback) of that behavior determine at least to some extent certain behaviors (eating, or not eating) of the individual throughout the day.

In a dyadic situation, behavior of either individual will effect the behavior of the other (see for example the vast literature pertaining to self fulfilling prophecies, e.g. Rosenthal and Jacobsen, 1968), and also the future behavior of the behavior himself (see for example the discussion of Self Attribution and the work of Bem (1967)), (as found in Hastorf, Schneider, and Polefka, 1970), or Bem (1970).

In the present study, with its coorientational nature, X in the A-B-X system is the relationship i.e., the system A-B itself! This provides a major advantage to the study of encounter groups, by providing a theoretical perspective in which to view the results that

training has on the individual, his understanding of others view of him, and the kind of views he has of other people. By the characteristics discussed in the study of systems, the A-B relationship must itself be a system. Likewise, both A and B are systems themselves, and subsystem components of A-B. By attempting to change the behavior of A (the group participant) we should also be changing the behavior of B (by the property of wholeness, or interdependence) in the A-B system. With changes reverberating through the system, the total value of the A-B relationship, for both A and B should be increased, thus meeting the synergy characteristic of systems. The effect of feedback on A's behavior should operate on the general principle of operant learning theory in that improvements in the A-B system (relationship). and should reinforce those behaviors (communication skills acquired through the group experience and training) which brought about the change, increasing the probability of those behaviors occurring again in the future. Also, the views of A as they change toward himself, and B, will effect B's behavior causing changes (self fulfilling prophecies) which will also reverberate through the system.

System theory is also useful in explaining why some relationships do not change. Homeostasis, is another property of systems. It means that systems attempt to maintain stability, and balance. One reason group training effects sometimes fail to generalize to the "outside" world of the participant may be that the homeostatic properties of the system he exists in outside the training situation are so strong. This

tendency is sometimes seen in the area of psychotherapy, where an individual in a residential center makes excellent progress but then returns to his former neurotic, or psychotic state when returned to the family setting (see for example Haley, 1963).

The Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory

The measures used in this study are the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (BLRI) and an experimenter modified version of the Barrett-Lennard. The BLRI was developed in 1962 (Barrett-Lennard, 1962) to measure the most important aspects of a clinical relationship as postulated by Rogers (1957). The BLRI therefore consists of five scales which Barrett-Lennard says might well be used in studying any important relationship. Most of the research done to date with the BLRI has been done within the clinical framework.

Of the elements critical to a therapeutic relationship postulated by Rogers (1957) Three seem to be of utmost importance. They are Congruence, Unconditional Positive Regard, and Empathetic Understanding. From these three, Barrett-Lennard developed four scales. These are Empathy, Congruence, Level of Regard, and Unconditionality of Regard. Barrett-Lennard also included one other scale, that being Willingness to be Known. Several authors (Clark and Culbert, 1965; Lannings and Lemmons, 1974; and Wiebe and Pearce, 1973) have suggested that when the entire measure is taken as a whole, it is in total a good general measure of the value of the relationship to the individual who filled out the

BLRI. Thus, in this study the five scales are also combined to form a sixth or total scale.

Description of the BLRI Scales

Congruence, as discussed by Rogers is a measure of the genuineness of an individual in a relationship. In a relationship, if he is congruent, he is fully integrated, freely and deeply himself, aware of his own feelings and showing these feelings to the other person in that relationship. When a person is congruent in a relationship, all of his communications are consistent. If he is frightened, he says so on both a verbal and nonverbal level. If he feels affection, this emotion too will be available to the other person in a consistent honest manner.

Unlike Rogers, however, Barrett-Lennard looked at this specific factor as one requiring "no positive conditions for overt communication of the individual's perceptions". (p. 4). This aspect of congruence was seen in the Willingness to be Known scale because of Rogers' conceptual requirement that all of the conditions he postulated as important in a clinical relationship must be communicated to the client to some minimal degree.

Empathy can best be described as the ability to get inside of someone else's head, and feel exactly the feelings they are feeling, and think the things they are thinking. Since this is impossible, empathy is operationalized as being able to understand and experience the "process and content of another person's awareness in all its aspects." (p. 3).

As can be seen from the above comments, this must include affective as well as cognitive aspects of another person's perceptual field as discussed by Combs, Richards, and Richards (1976).

Empathy like congruence as well as the other characteristics of a therapeutic relationship must be communicated to the other person. This communication is perhaps best exemplified in the scales for assessment of Interpersonal Functioning which were derived by Carkhuff (1969), from the earlier Truax Carkhuff Scales. Level 5, on the Empathy scale requires that a person not only understand and share with another person that person's thoughts, and feelings but also that

"The first person's responses add significantly to the feeling and meaning of the expressions of the second person in such a way as to (1) accurately express feelings levels below what the person himself was able to express or (2) in the event of ongoing deep self-exploration on the second person's part to be fully with him in his deepest moments".

(p. 317).

To be at level 5, the counselor then must actually know and understand the other person's feelings better than the other person himself. Empathy as it is described here then is the very essence that early studies in the area of person perception were trying to find.

Level of regard is perhaps the easiest of the scales to conceptualize. The level of regard scale refers to the strength of positive and/or negative feelings of one person for another in an interpersonal relationship. We are looking here at the range of feelings in the relationship.

Unconditionality of regard, unlike level of regard is probably the most difficult of the scales to conceptualize, and perhaps the most difficult to understand. Unconditionality of regard refers to the variability of a person's regard for another across time. If a person's feelings about another person are contingent upon the behaviors of that other person, then the regard would be highly conditional, and the variability between positive and negative feelings extreme. When on the other hand, an individual is either liked or disliked regardless of his behaviors, then the regard is unconditional.

For a relationship to be therapeutic, according to Rogers (1957, 1965), it must have positive regard, and that regard must be unconditional, i.e., the person is deserving of respect and praising regardless of his behaviors, but simply because all persons are deserving of such regard.

According to Barrett-Lennard, the Willingness to be Known scale relates to the appropriateness of self disclosure in the relationship. A person who is willing to tell the other person information about himself when that other person wants to share that information would be exhibiting a high degree of willingness to be known. Likewise, a person who does not thrust his own self disclosures into the relationship is also functioning at a high level of willingness to be known.

Conceptually, this variable fits best with congruence, in that a person is fully aware of his own emotions and feelings, and is willing to share that information with another. In fact, in other editions of the BLRI the Willingness To Be Known scale has been removed, (see for example McWhirter, 1973; Truax, 1966; and Wiebe and Pearce, 1973), as suggested by Barrett-Lennard himself for clinical relationships. (p. 28). Since the area of self disclosure is a major area within the Interpersonal Communication 110 class, and the relationships here are not clinical, it was decided to retain the Willingness To Be Known scale in this study. Additional work in this area by Altman and Taylor (1973), had indicated the importance of reciprocal self disclosure to the development of interpersonal relationships (p. 52-54). Extensive work in the area has also been done by Jourard (1968, 1971). Cozby (1973), has done an extensive review of the research in this area, and his work is of great value to persons seeking additional information in the area.

Weibe and Pearce (1973), note that the lowest correlation among the scales of the BLRI in their study was .49, significant at the .05 level of confidence. Since the scales tend to correlate highly together, they suggest as do Mills and Zytowski (1967) that there is perhaps a single general factor operating in the BLRI. Because of this possibility, the total scale is also being utilized as a measure in this study. Each of the scales in the BLRI is presented in Appendix 3, with the letter of the scale each item belongs to designated for the reader.

Use of the BLRI in the studies of encounter groups seems to be limited to those of Clark and Culbert (1965); Ciccatti (1970); and Lee (1969). Clark and Culbert used the BLRI within the group to see if those persons forming the most mutually therapeutic relationships would also show the greatest amount of improvement in self awareness. Their results were inconclusive. Ciccatti, found that there was a significant drop in the BLRI scales from pre to post on unconditionality of regard and congruence in a professionally led encounter group, while no significant changes occurred in a group using encounter tapes, or a group that was self directed using a one time demonstrational model for a stimulus. Ciccatti's data is difficult to interpret however since he does not tell who filled out the BLRI, or who the subject of the BLRI was. Lee found positive but not significant changes on three scales (empathy, congruence, and unconditionality of regard) of the BLRI filled out by roommates of 20 college students who underwent 20 hours of intensive group encounter. Generally then, few significant changes to date have been demonstrated in interpersonal relationship in encounter type groups using the BLRI.

The Experimenter Modified Relationship Inventory

Since one purpose of the study is to test the effects of the group experience on the accuracy of perception of the experimental subjects in their interpersonal relationships, a method of measuring that accuracy had to be found. Hungerman (1970), provided the initial method. He

asked 24 student counselors to predict the BLRI as he felt a client would respond. Hungerman utilized Cronbach's (1955) work in the analysis of his data and discovered that differential accuracy, i.e., accurate perception was a skill that can be learned, rather than a trait of the individual judge.

If, as encounter group theory would suggest, the group subject becomes more empathetic, congruent, willing to disclose, and has more unconditional positive regard, the system that exists between the subject and others in his environment should also change in a positive direction.

The process of interpersonal accuracy has best been studied by Laing, Phillipson, and Lee (1966), who state:

"We need concepts which indicate both the interaction and interexperience of two persons, and help us to understand the relation between each person's own experiences and his own behavior, always of course within the context of the relationship between them. Our concepts must also help us to understand the persons and their relations in relation to the system which their relationship creates.

(p. 7).

In the process of examining these systems from the point of view of the perception of the individuals involved, Laing et. al., conceptualized several levels of perception. Included, are direct perspectives, such as my view of myself, and the other person. The meta-perspective, the level of understanding, which is my view of the other's view of me, and the meta-meta-perspective, or my view of the

other's view of my view of him etc. Obviously, attempts to predict another's view of myself must fall into the meta-perspective level.

The reason the BLRI itself was modified rather than simply asking the subjects to fill the inventory out as he perceived his friend would fill it out, was to reduce confusion on the part of the subjects as to the meaning of any given item. As is the case with the regular BLRI, the modified BLRI consists of six scales, level of regard, empathy, congruence, unconditionality of regard, willingness to be known, and the total of each of the previous scales combined into the sixth scale. The modified version of the BLRI is presented in Appendix 4 with the scale of each item indicated for the reader.

Summary

In summary, little well controlled research has been done with regard to the questions of improved accuracy of interpersonal perception, and improved relationships as a result of encounter group or sensitivity training. Perhaps the greatest problem in the area is the fact accuracy of perception is so difficult to measure. Studies which have attempted to show that accuracy is a trait which is possessed by the individual have in general been unsuccessful. If, however, accuracy of interpersonal perception is a skill that can be improved in training, as shown in at least one study (Hungerman 1969), perhaps more work in this area can be undertaken. This work must be done from a coorientational perspective if it is to be of much value.

It must take into consideration as well, category systems which research subjects understand and share in regard to interpersonal relationships.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Subjects

Subjects in the experimental group consisted of a total of 24 students from one of the three sections of Interpersonal Communication 110, Introduction to Human Communication Relationships, at the University of Montana spring quarter 1976. All subjects included in the study were volunteers who took both the pretest and posttest with the Modified Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory, and suggested the name of a friend or significant other of the same sex, who also completed both pre and post measures with the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory.

Control group subjects consisted of 12 volunteer students enrolled in Interpersonal Communication 111, Introduction to Public Speaking at the University of Montana, also in spring quarter 1976. Instruction in the Public Speaking class does not overlap with the relationship skills training that takes place in Interpersonal Communication 110. Students in Public Speaking classes learn to organize, outline, prepare, deliver, and critique the delivery of public speeches (see Appendix 2). Each control subject like the experimental subjects filled out both measures, and also suggested the name of another person of the same sex who was a friend or significant other, and this person also completed both administrations of the BLRI.

All students who were enrolled simultaneously in both 110, and 111 were excluded from both samples.

Experimental Design

The nonequivalent control group design (Campbell and Stanley, 1963, pp. 47-50) was employed in this study since it was impossible for the experimenter to randomly assign subjects to the experimental and control conditions. The nonequivalent control group design requires administration of a pretest as well as a posttest in both the experimental and control groups. The major difference between the groups, is that between the pre and posttest administrations the experimental group undergoes some experimental treatment. Since subjects were self selected, certain problems in interpretation of results were present.

Materials

Materials for this study consist of the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory in sex appropriate forms and the experimenter modified version of the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory also in sex appropriate forms. Other materials required include the original volunteer sign-up forms for the Interpersonal Communication 110 and 111 classes. Two sets of directions were also required. These were for the pretest for both subjects and significant others. The Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory in both sex forms is reported in

Appendix 3. The Modified Barrett-Lennard is presented in Appendix 4, it also is presented in both sex forms. The sign-up forms, and direction sheets for both subjects and significant others for both the experimental and control groups, as well as for both the pre, and posttest are presented in Appendix 5.

Procedure

Students in Interpersonal Communication 110 and 111 were contacted during the first week of Spring Quarter and asked to volunteer for the experiment. Copies of the sign-up sheets for 110 and 111 were distributed at this time. No effort was made to obtain data during the first week of classes, because of the cautions pointed out by Harrison (1971). Harrison points out that the earliest sessions of a group experience are often anxious times for both group members and facilitators as well. The best time to collect data is prior to the start of the first group session. Due to the nature of these groups, this data gathering procedure was impossible. Harrison also recommends strongly that posttest data not be collected on the final day of a group experience when the full "glow" is on the participants. This "glow" presents accurate evaluation of the actual effects of the encounter situation. Collection of data for the pretests began at the end of the second week of classes and all data for the pretest, collected from both the subjects and their significant others was obtained before the end of the third week of classes.

Data collection procedures were as follows. Students who indicated a willingness to participate in the study were directed to go to room 339-A in the Liberal Arts Building at the University of Montana between 8:00 am and 4:00 pm Tuesday and Thursday, or 8:00-9:00 am, and 11:00-4:00 Monday, Wednesday and Friday. When a student arrived, they were asked if they were 110, or 111 students, or friends of 110 or 111 students. Each person was then given a copy of the sex appropriate BLRI, or modified BLRI. Each student then sat at a private carrel and completed the inventory. Because of the nature of the study, only complete sets of data, i.e., the BLRI from the significant other and the modified BLRI from the subjects were of use. All incomplete sets of data were discarded from the study. A total of thirty-two sets of data were discarded. Eighteen of these came from Interpersonal Communication 111, the Public Speaking class. Of this eighteen, nine sets failed to be completed at the pretest, and nine more at the posttest. Fourteen sets from Interpersonal Communication 110 were discarded. Of these eight were discarded at the outset, and the remaining six were incomplete at the posttest.

The posttest data was collected during the week preceding final week at the University of Montana Spring quarter 1976. Thus, there were approximately 40 hours of class time in Interpersonal Communication 110 between completion of the pretests and posttests for the study. It was decided that an attempt to collect posttest data during

final week of the quarter would be nearly impossible because it would be in direct competition with studying for and taking of final exams, as well as deadlines for term papers. There was no way to collect posttest data following the final week of the quarter.

Before data could be utilized in the study, complete sets had to be obtained for both the subject and significant other on both the pretest and posttests. Thirty-two sets of incomplete data had to be discarded. Several personal contacts were made with subjects and significant others in an attempt to obtain as many complete sets of data as possible for both the experimental and control groups.

The times and place of data collection remained the same for the posttests as in pretesting. Students and the significant others completed the posttests again in Room 339-A of the Liberal Arts Building.

Statistical Treatment of Data

Because there were two major questions addressed in the study, two different types of statistical analysis were utilized.

The first question was concerned with the importance of interpersonal relationships of the subjects to the significant others. This information was obtained on the BLRI filled out by the significant others. Because of the quasi-experimental nature of the study which prevented the experimenter from randomly assigning subjects (and therefore significant others) to the experimental or control conditions, it was necessary to employ an analysis of covariance using significant

others pretest scores as the covariate, to adjust for initial differences between the experimental and control groups.

The second question regards the accuracy of interpersonal perception. In order to address this question, it was necessary to correlate the pretests of the significant others with the pretests of the subjects, and then to compare these with the correlations between the posttests of the significant others with the posttests of the subjects. Blalock's (1960) formula for comparison of correlations from independent samples was then utilized to see if the correlations for the experimental group were significantly different from those of the control group.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Covariance and Correlation Results

The first question to be considered is how the modified encounter group experience effected important interpersonal relationships of the subjects outside of the group itself. Only that data relating to the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory obtained from subjects' and controls' significant others need be considered here. It was hypothesized that the experimental group would improve significantly when compared to those in the control group, on all five scales of the BLRI (level of Regard, Empathy, Congruence, Unconditionality of Regard, and Willingness to be known) as well as the total composite of the five scales. Since there was a possibility that the two groups were significantly different at the outset, because of the inability of the experimenter to randomly assign the subjects, analysis of covariance was utilized. This procedure utilized the pretest means for each group for the covariate.

By examining the information in Table 1., the reader can see the pretest means as well as the posttest means and the mean gains for both the experimental and control groups. As will be seen, the significant others of both groups were not completely positive in their evaluation of the experimental and control group subjects. One of the scale means

for the experimental group (Congruence) declined from the pretest to the posttest. Four of the six scales for the control group (Level of Regard, Empathy, Congruence, and Willingness to be Known) also declined. The lower the mean score of the BLRI scales, the more poorly the individual rated is seen by the person filling out the form.

Table 1. Mean Gains for Experimental and Control Group's Significant Others on the BLRI.

Interpersonal Communication 110 Pretest Posttest Means and Gains			
Variables	Pretest	Posttest	Gain
Regard	38.37	40.12	1.75
Empathy	13.29	15.33	2.04
Congruence	27.79	25.79	-2.00
Unconditionality of Regard	7.08	8.92	1.83
Willingness to be Known	23.71	23.79	.08
Total	103.46	112.83	9.37
Interpersonal Communication 111 Pretest Posttest Means and Gains			
Variables	Pretest	Posttest	Gain
Regard	34.00	31.33	-2.67
Empathy	15.17	12.50	-2.67
Congruence	23.17	22.17	-1.00
Unconditionality of Regard	2.17	2.25	.08
Willingness to be Known	20.08	19.92	-.17
Total	83.68	88.25	4.58

In order to tell if these mean changes are significant it is necessary to look at the results of the analysis of covariance for each of the five scales as well as the combined total scale. The information in Table 2., provides these results. At this point in the discussion, we need be interested only in the Adjusted Posttest Comparison figures. Only the first scale presented, i.e., Level of Regard changed significantly from the pretest to the posttest. This indicates that the significant others of the experimental group subjects, saw the subjects as having significantly greater regard for them at the time of pretesting.

Table 2. Results of the analysis of Covariance Procedure for the Experimental and Control Groups.

Variable 1. Level of Regard				
Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Squares	F
Pretest Differences				
(Covariate) Regard	2289.40	1	2289.40	48.67*
Adjusted Posttest Comparison	295.97	1	295.97	6.20*
Residual	1552.27	33	47.94	

Table 2. (Continued)

Variable 2. Empathy				
Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Squares	F
Pretest Differences				
(Covariate) Empathy	2750.24	1	2750.24	35.46*
Adjusted Posttest Comparison	148.67	1	148.67	1.92
Residual	2559.64	33	18.68	

Variable 3. Congruence

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Squares	F
Pretest Differences				
(Covariate) Congruence	3798.78	1	3798.78	34.60*
Adjusted Posttest Comparison	1.11	1	1.11	.01
Residual	3622.87	33	109.78	

Table 2. (Continued)

Variable 4. Unconditionality of Regard

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Squares	F
Pretest Differences				
(Covariate) Unconditionality	4221.16	1	4221.16	35.86*
Adjusted Posttest Comparison	63.39	1	63.39	.58
Residual	3885.09	33	117.73	

Variable 5. Willingness to be Known

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Squares	F
Pretest Differences				
(Covariate) Willingness	1247.77	1	1247.44	25.95*
Adjusted Posttest Comparison	29.24	1	29.24	.61
Residual	1586.32	33	48.07	

Table 2. (Continued)

Variable 6. The Total Scale

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Squares	F
Pretest Differences				
(Covariate) Total	53624.30	1	53624.30	46.74*
Adjusted Posttest Comparison	113.13	1	113.13	.10
Residual	37860.87	33	1147.30	

*Significant at the p .05 level of confidence

Of all the findings, the most startling no doubt is the fact that the two groups did in fact differ significantly at the time of pre-testing on every one of the scales, as well as the total of the five scales, as can be seen by examining the pretest results which were also presented in Table 2. This indicates that the control group because it so drastically differed from the experimental group from the outset, was not appropriate to fully explain the results of the experimental treatment. This factor will be discussed in greater depth in Chapter V: Discussion of Results and Implications for Future Research.

The second major question addressed concerned the accuracy of subjects in both the experimental and control groups in predicting the responses of their significant others on the BLRI. Considering the results of the analysis of covariance procedure, it is necessary to first see if any significant differences existed between the two groups at the time of pretesting. Table 3., presents the pretest correlations for both experimental and control subjects with their significant others, as well as a test of these correlations for significant differences between groups (Blalock, 1960).

Table 3. Pretest Correlations Between the Subjects and Their Significant Others for Both Experimental and Control Groups

Variable	INCO 110	INCO 111	z
Level of Regard	.50	-.38	2.42*
Empathy	.41	-.25	1.73*
Congruence	.64	.23	1.31
Unconditionality of Regard	.34	-.03	.96
Willingness to be Known	.45	.11	.96
Total	.55	-.08	1.74*

* z 1.65 is significant at the .05 level of confidence.

As can be seen by examining these figures, again at the time of pretesting there were significant differences between the experimental and the control group. The experimental group at the beginning of the experiment were significantly more accurate in predicting their significant others' responses on three scales (Level of Regard, Empathy, and the Total scale). At the time of posttesting, however, none of the obtained correlations for the experimental group remained significantly different from the control group, as can be seen by examining Table 4.

Table 4. Posttest Correlations Between the Subjects and Their Significant Others for Both Experimental and Control Groups

Variable	INCO 110	INCO 111	z
Level of Regard	.56	.10	1.33
Empathy	.70	.39	1.17
Congruence	.52	.21	.91
Unconditionality of Regard	.26	.18	.22
Willingness to be Known	.42	.34	.19
Total	.44	.31	.39

* z 1.65 is significant at the .05 level of confidence

This indicates that the hypothesized improvement in interpersonal perception as defined in this study did not occur as a result of the experimental treatment.

Additional Treatment of Data

There were, however, some improvements in accuracy though these were not significant. The greatest amount of improvement took place for persons in the Interpersonal Communication 111 class. However, none of the correlations for the Interpersonal Communication 111 subjects and their significant others ever differed from levels that we could expect from chance. Eleven of the twelve obtained correlations for the experimental group did differ from chance, even though they were not significantly different from those of the controls. An important point to note however, is that since the experimental group is larger than the control group, the control group's correlations have to be greater in order to reach statistical significance. Table 5., presents both the pretest, and posttest correlations for both groups for easy comparison.

Despite the size of the control group, attention to the present data is somewhat alarming. In four out of six correlations, the perception of the control group subjects was actually negatively correlated! Since the control subjects, like the experimentals were instructed to choose a friend of the same sex (Appendix 4), one must wonder about the quality of these friendships, when the agreement between friends

Table 5. Pretest and Posttest Correlations of Subjects With Their Significant Others for Both Experimental and Control Groups

Variable	INCO 110		INCO 111	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Level of Regard	.50*	.56*	-.38	.10
Empathy	.41*	.70*	-.25	.39
Congruence	.64*	.52*	.23	.21
Unconditionality of Regard	.34*	.26	-.03	.18
Willingness to be Known	.45*	.42*	-.11	.34
Total	.55*	.44*	-.08	.31

* $P \leq .05$

on the behaviors and attitudes of one member of the pair is virtually nonexistent. This question will be addressed to a greater extent in Chapter V.

On the posttest questionnaires, both the subjects in the experimental and control groups as well as the significant others were asked to indicate whether they had discussed the pretest questionnaires between the pretest and posttest. Forty-four percent of the pairs indicated that they did discuss the pretests. Out of the control group, forty-one percent indicated they had, and forty-five percent of the experimental subjects also responded positively. There seems to be no significant difference between the two groups in this area. Of

those discussing the pretests, about one third (i.e., about 13 percent of the total N) indicated that they discussed the relationship between them in relation to the questionnaires. This thirty-one percent was divided nearly equally between the two groups. Only one person felt that the questionnaire might not have been a measure of his perception of the significant other.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

There were two major questions addressed in this study. The first was how a modified encounter type of experience would effect the accuracy of interpersonal perception. When the results were examined it was discovered that no hypothesized improvement in the accuracy of interpersonal perception occurred with the subjects significant others, in dyads outside of the group setting. By comparing the pretest correlations of the subjects modified Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory scores, with the posttests on these same measures, one will see an actual decline in accuracy. Though none of these declines were significant, the direction of change does cause concern.

As discussed in Chapter II, improvement in the accuracy of perception of others and the generalization of this skill to relationships outside of the group experience, are major assumptions in the theoretical framework surrounding group research. Both Campbell and Dunnette (1968) and Smith (1975a) have noted that to date, no one has shown these assumptions true. The current study is also unsuccessful in this regard. Again, as in the past, however, measurement of accuracy itself may be partly to blame for the results. The fact remains, however, that while Interpersonal Communication 110 students

were significantly more accurate than the controls in Interpersonal Communication 111 at the time of pretesting on three of the six scales of the BLRI, these differences were no longer significant at the time of pretesting.

The second major question addressed in this study relates to the changes in important relationships between group participants and persons outside of the group, as a result of group participation. To study this question, an attempt was made to obtain ratings of the subjects actual behaviors and attitudes in that relationship at the beginning and end of the group experience. These behaviors and attitudes correspond to the "Necessary and Sufficient" conditions for therapeutic change as postulated by Rogers (1957), and for all important relationships as suggested by Barrett-Lennard (1962). It was assumed by Barrett-Lennard that the higher the score for each scale (Level of Regard, Empathy, Congruence, Unconditionality of Regard, and Willingness to be Known, plus the composite of those five scales), the greater the value of that relationship to the individual who filled out the measure.

At the time of posttesting, only the level of regard scale had improved significantly for the experimental subjects when compared with the controls. This indicates that persons in dyads with the experimental subjects outside of the group setting saw those people as having more positive, and consistent regard for them as persons in those relationships.

Perhaps the comment made by McHenry (1971), in his critique of the accuracy research holds here as well. It may be that while the conditions set out by Rogers (1957) are necessary for therapeutic change, they may well not be the criteria used by persons who do not share his theoretical perspective, in determining the value of a given relationship. That is, the judge (the person completing the BLRI) may not agree with the professionals on what is important in the relationship. It may be that what is called for here is development of a new tool that takes the category systems of "normal" persons into account where important interpersonal relationships are involved.

Methodological Problems

There are several methodological problems that have become apparent in this study. The first, and no doubt most simple is the extremely small sample size. Though all three sections of Interpersonal Communication 110 and all six sections of Interpersonal Communication 111 were contacted, only 24 former, and 12 in the latter completed the experimental procedure. As any person involved in behavioral science research is aware, it is extremely difficult to demonstrate significant differences between groups, with groups this size. The difficulty of obtaining and retaining subjects in this experimental procedure was probably directly related to the fact that subjects in volunteering, volunteered the time of a friend, or significant other of the same sex as well. Fifteen sets of data had to be discarded from pretest to

posttest because they were incomplete, that is, the posttest data could not be obtained. Nine of these came from the INCO 111 class which had only half as many people complete the entire experiment. Another set of 17 persons were excluded at the outset, because they did not have inventories for their significant others on the pretest. Again, there were nine persons in the INCO 111 class in this group.

Still another factor in the difficulty to obtain data, and therefore have groups of large size was the duration of the experiment. Seven weeks passed between the pretests and posttests, and this also no doubt had a marked effect on the inability to obtain complete sets of data.

A second and perhaps more important methodological problem is an aspect of the design itself. The design, as mentioned in Campbell and Stanley (1963), is frequently used in educational settings where the experimenter is dealing with self selected intact groups. The weakest form of this design has not only intact groups, but the experimenter cannot even randomly assign the experimental conditions to these groups. Since Interpersonal Communication 110 in this study was the independent variable, this random assignment was impossible.

It was originally assumed that Interpersonal Communication 110, and 111 would be equivalent, since both were required for communication majors, and both met part of the English-Communication requirement for many non-majors. Both classes were also designed for freshman level students.

The two classes, however, on the contrary may well not have been equivalent in other very important respects. The registration procedures at the University of Montana, allow all seniors, and graduate students to register for classes before the freshmen, sophomores, and juniors. Since many people are somewhat fearful or, at least concerned about being forced into a public speaking situation, many seniors who were finishing up their requirements, would choose to take the Interpersonal Communication 110 (Introduction to Human Communication Relationships) courses rather than Interpersonal Communication 111 (Introduction to Public Speaking). Still other students, both seniors, and graduate students took the 110 course because it appeared interesting, broadened their perspective, and/or because it offered five credits while the 111 course offered only three credits.

As a result, there were many seniors in the 110 class, and many more freshmen, sophomores, and juniors in the public speaking classes.

By examining the results of the covariance procedures, it is possible to see how these two groups did in fact differ at the beginning of the experiment. All six of the scales of the BLRI, Level of Regard, Empathy, Congruence, Unconditionality, Willingness to be Known, and the total of these scores, were significantly higher for significant others of students in the Interpersonal Communication 110 class than for the students in the control condition. Likewise, the accuracy of subjects in the 110 class was significantly better on three scales (Level of Regard, Empathy, and the total) of the BLRI than were the 111 subjects.

One possible explanation for these findings seems to be that the two groups were highly different from the very outset. In retrospect, it would have been beneficial to compare the ages of subjects in each of the groups, as well as the duration of the relationships existing between the subjects, and their "significant others". It is highly interesting to speculate on the quality of dyads when there is virtually no agreement between the pair on the behavior and attitudes of at least one of the members.

If the relationships of the 111 students were in fact of very short duration at the time of pretesting, the fact that the accuracy of interpersonal perception while not differing from chance at the pre-test, improved for them on four of the six scales at the time of post-testing, could be due to the intervening seven weeks. The failure for the experimental group to change significantly as a result of the treatment might be due to the fact that the relationships they had, had been long term, and therefore much more stable and balanced, and less prone to radical changes. The strength of these relationships may also help account for the fact that twice as many subjects in the three Interpersonal Communication 110 classes completed the experiment, yet about twice as many Interpersonal Communication 111 students in the six classes were contacted. Wittich's (1955) results too would tend to confirm this interpretation. He found, using work groups with at least four months of contact, that accuracy was significantly greater than chance. He also found that psychological adjustment was

positively related to the ability to predict and be predicted. Rogers (1965), notes as well that clients who are better adjusted at the beginning of therapy tend to perceive more of these therapeutic conditions and eventually improve more than persons less well adjusted. It may well be that the academic and personal confusion of younger students helped cause the significant lower scores at the pretest levels. Thus, the maturity and relative stability of older students may have been a major factor in their significantly higher BLRI scores, as well as their significantly better perception at the present levels.

Since even the researchers in the field have been unable to determine the criteria that should be used to assess accuracy, it is ridiculous to assume that subjects in such studies can even obtain the level of complete accuracy. Perhaps the students in the Interpersonal Communication 110 class had attained a ceiling on the actual perceptual accuracy possible in those relationships. If one looks at the reliability of the BLRI as reported by Barrett-Lennard, it is possible to conclude that the declines made by the 110 group at the posttest were due to regression. It must be noted as well that two of the six scales did in fact increase, and that the accuracy of persons in the 110 class was always superior to that of the students in Interpersonal Communication 111.

Still another factor must also be considered when examining the decline in four of the scales of the BLRI. Many of the people in the

110 class were seniors, and would be graduating at the completion of the quarter the study was undertaken. These persons may have strated to insulate themselves from the hurt that would come when both members of the relationship finished their studies, and went their separate ways. Of the five scales on the BLRI, it will be remembered that the only one to improve significantly from pre to post-testing was the level of regard, which may indicate that the relationships were rapidly changing from active friendships to cherished memories, with less psychological involvement.

An extremely simple experiment could be easily carried out to test this interpretation. One would simply have to obtain complete sets of data for seniors, and there significant others, and freshman and their significant others, and then compare this data statistically to get a hold on the kind of differences that exist between these two groups due to the maturity, greater social experience, and stability the seniors have had an opportunity to obtain.

If no significant differences appeared as a result of this experimental procedure, we would have to conclude that the initial differences obtained in the present study must be due to the self-selection of students into these two classes. It may be for example that the people who actively seek encounter type experiences differ from those who seek public speaking types of experiences. If persons here are infact self selected, then the only way to obtain an adequate control group would be by going outside of the college course medium, toward a

modified encounter experience provided through a college counseling and testing center, community mental health agency, or other organization, where all participants were infact volunteers who have chosen to undergo the experience. These people could then be randomly assigned to experimental and control conditions with the control group receiving the experience in a second group, presented after the first group experience. Many additional questions could also be addressed in this kind of setting with a Solomon four way design.

Additional work must also be done with regard to improvement in the accuracy of interpersonal perception as a result of group experience. This question is central to the area. If accuracy is not improved, then much of the previous work in the area will have to be reexamined in light of this finding. Theoretical developments in the area will have to take a new look at "sensitivity" training. Additional research must also address the question concerning the generalization of learning from the "safe" atmosphere of the group setting of situations removed from the group. If learning does not generalize, the group experience, while fun or exciting cannot be of great value.

As suggested earlier, there is probably no such thing as perfect perception in interpersonal relationships. Just where the ceiling is, also cannot be known. It seems possible that total accuracy in some relationships might be too much of a good thing. Inaccuracy could under some circumstances serve a useful purpose. One of the failures

of many theorists is that once an idea or concept is elucidated and a continuum of the skill or characteristic is established, they consistently believe that more is better. This of course is not true.

Where total empathy (like level 5 suggested by Carkhuff, 1972), is essential in a clinical relationship, it could well be destructive in the more common, less intense kinds of relationships that a person usually experiences. It would be disconcerting for many if not most people to discover that a large number of persons actually understand their emotions and behaviors better than they do themselves. In important interpersonal relationships, inaccuracy is no doubt usually seen as agreement. People do after all tend to be attracted to people who are similar to them. When new situations arise, and people do not accurately perceive their friends' options and attitudes, these perceived opinions and attitudes are probably closer to the opinions and attitudes of the perceiver, than to the person perceived. Likewise, the perceiver probably sees the attitudes of those he dislikes as being further from his point of view than they actually are, when a high degree of inaccuracy occurs.

The inaccuracy of interpersonal perception then serves a functional purpose for the perceiver. As mentioned before, the perceiver is not a passive objective receiver of stimuli in his environment, but rather an active, subjective seeker of the stimuli which he chooses to perceive and not perceive in the environment. Such inaccuracy then

protects the individual from psychologically threatening information which if perceived, would require change on his part.

Though this study does not finally answer all of the questions it addressed, it does provide many suggestions for future research in the area which will be of far more value than might be chosen without regard to its findings.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adair, John G. The Human Subject. The Social Psychology of the Psychological Experiment. Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1973.
- Adler, Ron, and Towne, Neil. Looking Out/Looking In Interpersonal Communication. San Francisco: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975.
- Altman, Irwin, and Taylor, Dalmis A. Social Penetration: The Development of Interpersonal Relationships. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.
- Asch, Solomon E. Forming Impressions of Personality. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1946, 41, 258-290.
- Barrett-Lennard, G.T. Dimensions of Therapist Response as Casual Factors in Therapeutic change. *Psychological monography*, 1962, 76, 43, (whole No. 562).
- Bem, Darly J. Self Perception: An alternative Interpretation Cognitive Dissonance Phenoma. *Psychological Review*, 1967, 74, 183-200.
- _____, Beliefs, Attitudes, and Human Affairs. Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1970.
- Blalock, Hubert M. (Jr.). Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.
- Boyd, J.B., and Elliss, J.D. Findings of Research Into Senior Management Seminars. Toronto: Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario, 1962.
- Bradford, Leland P. Biography of an Institution. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 1967, 3, 2, 127-154.
- Bronfenbrenner, Urie, Harding, John and Gallwey, Mary. The measurement of skill in social perception. In McClelland, D.C., Baldwin, A.L., Bronfenbrenner, U. and Strodbeck, F.L. *Talent and Society.* Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1958, 29-111.

- Bunker, Douglas R. Individual Applications of Laboratory Training. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 1965, 1, 2, 131-148.
- Burke, Richard L., and Bennis, Warren G. Changes in Perception of Self and Others During Human Relations Training. *Human Relations*, 1961, 14, 165-183.
- Campbell, Donald T. and Stanley, Julian C. Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Co., 1963.
- Campbell, John P. and Dunnette, Marvin D. Effectiveness of T-Group Experiences In Managerial Training and Development. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1968, 70, 2, 73-104.
- Carkhuff, Robert R. Helping and Human Relations. A Primer for Lay and Professional Helpers. Volume II Practice and Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.
- Chaffee, Steven H. Pseudo-Data in Communication Research. Paper presented to the Symposium on Coorientation Communication Theory and Methodology Division. Association for Education in Journalism. Columbia, South Carolina, 1971.
- _____, and McLeod, Jack M. Sensitization in Panel Design: A coorientational experiment. *Journalism Quarterly* 1968, 45, 661-669.
- Ciccatti, Samuel Mike. Comparison of three methods of facilitating Encounter Groups in a College Environment. Dissertation Abstracts 1970, 31B, #5, 2954-2955.
- Clark, James V. and Culbert, Samuel A. Mutually Therapeutic Perception and Self-Awareness in a T-Group. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 1965, 1, 180-195.
- Combs, Arthur W., Richards, Anne Cohen, and Richards, Fred. Perceptual Psychology: A Humanistic Approach to the Study of Persons. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1976.
- Cooper, Gary L. How Psychologically Dangerous are T-Groups and Encounter Groups? *Human Relations*. 1975, 23, 3, 249-260.
- Cozby, Paul C. Self-Disclosure: A Literature Review. *Psychological Bulletin* 1973, 74, 2, 73-88.

- Cronbach, Lee J. Processes Affecting Scores on "understanding of others" and assumed "similarity". *Psychological Bulletin*, 1955, 52, 177-193.
- _____. Proposals Leading to Analytic Treatment of Social Perception Scores. In R. Tagiuri and L. Petrullo (Eds.), *Person Perception and Interpersonal Behavior*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1958, 353-379.
- Danish, Steven J. Factors Influencing Changes in Empathy Following a Group Experience. *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 1971, 18, 3, 262-267.
- _____ and Kagen, N. Measurement of Affective Sensitivity: Toward a Valid Measure of Interpersonal Perception. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1971, 18, 1, 51-54.
- Dimond, Michael J. and Shapiro, Jerrold L. Method and Paradigm in Encounter Group Research. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* 1975, 15, 2, 59-70.
- Dymond, Rosalind F. A Scale for the Measurement of Empathetic Ability. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 1949, 13, 127-133.
- _____. Personality and Empathy. *Journal of Consulting Psychology* 1950, 14, 343-350.
- Foulds, Melvin L. Effects of a Personal Growth Group on a Measure of Selfactualization. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* 1970, 10, 1, 33-38.
- _____. Effects of a Personal Growth Group on Ratings of Self and Others. *Small Group Behavior* 1973, 4, 508-512.
- _____, Girona, Ricardo, and Guinan, James F. Changes in Ratings of Self and Others as a Result of a Marathon Group. *Comparative Group Studies*. 1970, 1, 349-355.
- _____, _____ and Warehime, Robert G. Marathon Group Changes in a Measure of Dogmatism. *Small Group Behavior*, 1974, 5, 4, 387-392.
- Gage, N.L. Accuracy of Social Perception and Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relationships. *Journal of Personality*, 1953, 22, 128-141.

- Gassner, Suzanne M., Gold, Jerome, and Snadowsky, Alvin M. Changes in the Phenomenal field as a result of Human Relations Training. *Journal of Psychology*, 1964, 58, 33-41.
- Gibb, Jack R. The Message from Research. In Pfeiffer, J., William, and Jones, John E. The 1974 Annual Handbook for Group Facilitators. La Jolla, California: University Associates 1974.
- Grater, Harry. Changes in Self and Other Attitudes in a Leadership Training Group. *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 1959, 37, 493-496.
- Haley, Jay. Strategies of Psychotherapy. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1963.
- Harrison, Roger. Impact of the Laboratory on Perceptions of others by the Experimental Group. In Argyris, Chris and Harrison, Roger. Interpersonal Competence and Organizational Effectiveness. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press Inc., 1962.
- . Research on Human Relations Training: Design and Interpretation. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 1971, 7, 1, 71-85.
- Hastorf, A.H. and Bender, I.E. A Caution Respecting the Measurement of Empathic Ability. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*. 1952, 47, 574-576.
- , Richardson, Stephen A., and Dornbusch, Sanford M. The problem of relevance in the Study of Person Perception In Tagiuri, Renato and Petrullo, Luigi. Person Perception and Interpersonal Behavior. Stanford, California: Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1959.
- , Schneider, David J., and Polefka, Judith. Person Perception. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1970.
- Heider, Fritz. The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations. New York: Wiley, 1958.
- Hewitt, Jan, and Kraft, Marty. Effects of an Encounter Group Experience on Self-Perception and Interpersonal Relations. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1973, 40, 1, 162.

- Hofstede, Geert. Perceptions of others after a T-Group. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*. 1975. 11, 3, 367-377.
- Hungerman, J. Michael. The Relationship of Sensitivity to others to certain selected Personality Characteristics. Dissertation Abstracts International. 1971, Section A, 31, 10-12 #5128A
- Jourard, Sidney M. Disclosing Man to Himself. New York: D. VanNostrand Co. 1971.
- _____. The Transparent Self. New York: D. VanNostrand Co., 1975.
- Laing, R.D., Phillipson, H., and Lee, A.R. Interpersonal Perception a Thory and a Method of Research. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.
- Lanning, Wayne L. and Lemons, Stephen L. Another look at the Factor Structure of the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory. *Measurement in Education and Guidance*, 1974, 6, 4, 228-231.
- Lee, Robert E. Relationship between basic encounter group and change in Self Concepts and Interpersonal Relationships of College Low Achievers. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1969, 30-A #6, 2336-2337.
- Liekerman, Morton A. Joy Less Facts? A Response to Schutz, Smith, and Rowan. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*. 1975, 15, 2, 49-54.
- _____, Yalom, Irvin D., and Miles, Matthew B. Encounter Groups: First Facts. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1973.
- McHenry, Robert. New Methods of Assessing the Accuracy of Interpersonal Perception. *Journal of Theory and Social Behavior*, 1971, 1, 2, 109-119.
- McLeod, Jack M. and Chaffee, Steven H. Interpersonal Approaches to Communication Research. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 1973, 16, 4, 469-499.
- McWhirter, J.J. Two Measures of the Facilitative conditions: A correlation study. *Journal of Conseling Psychology*, 1973, 20, 4, 317-320.

- Maltz, Maxwell, Psycho-Cybernetics. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1960.
- Miles, Matthew B. Rejoinder to Schutz, Smith, and Rowan. Journal of Humanistic Psychology. 1975, 15, 2, 55-58.
- Mills, David H. and Zytowski, Donald G. Helping Relationship: A structural analysis. Journal of Counseling Psychology. 1967, 14, 3, 193-197.
- Newcomb, Theodore M. An approach to the study of communicative acts. Psychological Review, 1953, 60, 393-404.
- _____. Some varieties of interpersonal attraction. In J. G. Peatman and Hartley, E.L. (Eds.) Festschrift for Gardner Murphy. 1960, pp. 171-182.
- _____. The Acquaintance Process. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1961.
- Pfeiffer, J. William and Jones, John E. A Handbook of Structured Experiences for Human Relations Training. Volume 1. San Diego, California: University Associates, 1969.
- _____, and _____. A Handbook of Structured Experiences for Human Relations Training. Volume 2. La Jolla, California: University Associates. 1970.
- _____, and _____. A Handbook of Structured Experiences for Human Relations Training. Volume 3. LaJolla, California: University Associates. 1971.
- _____, _____. The 1972 Annual Handbook for Group Facilitators. La Jolla, California: University Associates, 1972.
- Polsin, James H. Communicating with an Audience. Introductory Exercises. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co., 1974.
- Rogers, Carl R. The Necessary and Sufficient Conditions of Therapeutic Personality Change. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1957, 21, 2, 95-103.
- _____. The Therapeutic Relationship: Recent Theory and Research. Australian Journal of Psychology, 1965, 17, 95-108.

- Rogers, Carl R. On Encounter Groups. La Jolla, California: Harper and Row, 1970.
- Rosenthal, Robert and Jacobsen, Lenore. Pygmalion in the Classroom. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1968.
- Ross, W. Donald, Kligfeld, Michael and Whitman, Roy W. Psychiatrists, Patients and Sensitivity Groups. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 1971, 25, 178-180.
- Rowan, John. Encounter Group Research: No Joy? *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 1975, 15, 2, 19-28.
- Schelling, Thomas C. The Strategy of Conflict. London: Oxford University Press, 1960.
- Schutz, Will. Not Encounter and certainly not facts. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 1975, 15, 2, 7-18.
- Smith, Peter B. Controlled Studies of the Outcome of Sensitivity Training. *Psychological Bulletin*. 1975a, 82, 4, 597-622.
- . Are there Adverse Effects of Sensitivity Training? *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* 1975, 15, 2, 29-47.
- Snadowsky, Alvin M. and Belkin, Glenn. Affecting Change in the Phenomenal field. A cognitive technique used during an intensive group experience. *Small Group Behavior*, 1974, 5, 4, 506-511.
- Stone, G.C., Gage, N.L., and Leavitt, G.S. Two Kinds of accuracy in predicting another's responses. *Journal of Social Psychology*. 1957, 45, 245-254.
- Taguiri, Renato. Social Preference and its Perception. In Taguiri, Renato, and Petrullo, Luigi (Eds). Person Perception and Interpersonal Behavior. Stanford: Stanford University Press. 316-336.
- . Person Perception. In Lindzey, Gardner and Aronson, Elliot, (Eds). The Handbook of Social Psychology. Volume 3. The Individual in a Social Context. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

- Thomas, W.I. The Behavior pattern and the situation. Publications of the American Sociological Society, 1926, 22, 1-13.
- Traux, Charles B. Therapist Empathy, Warmth, and Genuineness and Patient Personality Change in Group Psychotherapy: A comparison between interaction unit measures, time sample measure, patient perception measures. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1966, 22, 225-229.
- Vernon, Philip E. Some Characteristics of the Good Judge of Personality. Journal of Social Psychology, 1933, 4, 42-57.
- Wiebe, Bernie, and Pearce, Barnett, W. An item-analysis of the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1973, 29, 4, 495-97.
- Wilmot, William W. Dyadic Communication. A Transactional Perspective. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1975.
- Wittich, John J. The generality of the prediction of self reports. Journal of Consulting Psychology 1955, 19, 6, 445-448.
- Yalom, Irvin D. and Lieberman, Morton A. A study of Encounter Group Casualties. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1974, 25, 16-30.

APPENDIX 1

Interpersonal Communication 110 Activities

All three of the Groups utilized in this study had several common threads running through them. First they all met in Spring quarter on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday for two hours each day. All utilized the same textbook Adler and Towne (1973). Many of the activities carried out in any given group were carried out in one, or both of the others. All three for example utilized the Dyadic Encounter, an exercise developed by Pfeiffer and Jones (1969). The Dyadic Encounter is a booklet of questions which are discussed by two persons in a dyad. They require a good deal of self disclosure, and seem to facilitate the process of getting acquainted. The items in the Dyadic Encounter are open ended statements which the participants are instructed to complete. They cover a broad range of personal emotions, situations and actions. Some examples are, My name is... When I'm in a new group... The Thing that turns me off most is... My weakest point is... Right now I'm feeling...etc.

Though each group utilized the exercise, it was used differently in each class. In one class it was used once between members of the class. In another class it was utilized three times within the class. In the last section, it was used once in class, and each student was required to repeat the exercise with some person who was not in the class.

All students in all sections were also required to maintain a journal of daily class activities, which was reviewed by the group facilitators periodically. Each class began each day with sound-offs where students could bring up any matters of interest to them. All groups also met at least once, outside of class socially. Each group had as its major concern, the communication of the students, both within and outside of the group setting.

The material that follows is an account of the activities held in each section of Interpersonal Communication 110, spring quarter at the University of Montana. A brief description of each exercise will be provided, and where two groups did the same thing, instead of redundancy, the reader will be referred to the initial description.

Group 1.

Day One: Course orientation, then the class was divided into dyads (groups of 2) and each member was told to find three unique things about their partner, who they then introduced to the class. After these introductions the name game was used. Here each person said his/her name, and tried to recall in order the names of others in the class.

Day Two: Students took the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI).

In the second half of class, the Dyadic Encounter was started.

Day Three: Completion of the Dyadic Encounter, with a pull-out (class discussion on the exercise itself). Discussion of the "Entry Phase" in Interpersonal Relationships.

Day Four: Each person was asked to bring an object to class they felt represented them. These were shared with the entire class.

Day Five: Each person was asked to draw their self-concept to share with class.

Day Six: Class divided into small task groups required to make a class presentation later in the class.

Day Seven: Second Dyadic Encounter.

Day Eight: Discussion of assertiveness, and its relation to behavior in small groups, with reference to situations in class. Pull out second hour.

Day Nine: Rejection and Defense Mechanisms. Role playing and pull out.

Day Ten: Inference/Observation. This is a situation where a person is given a short description of a situation and then required to answer questions about the description. The questions while originally appearing simple recall of facts, are not. They frequently require the student to make inferences which may, or may not be correct. The exercise was utilized to show the importance of perception. Following this discussion students viewed a film titled Information Processing.

Day Eleven: Students viewed the film Eye of the Beholder and then in small groups discussed their perception of self and compared it with others preception of them.

Day Twelve: Continuation of work with perception. Utilized the "Scissors game". Students are required to discover the "gimmick" of

the game. The scissors are passed from one person to another "crossed" or "open". The gimmick is that the words crossed and open refer to the person passing legs, rather than to the scissors.

Day Thirteen: Dyadic Encounter with a least trusted person in class.

Day Fourteen: Pull out of Day Thirteen's Dyadic Encounter.

Day Fifteen: First task group presentation on Nonverbal, Touching in Communication. Exercises and Pull out.

Day Sixteen: Open discussion, requiring students to take some responsibility for group progress and activities.

Day Seventeen: Two dimensions of Interpersonal Relations, Affect and Power. Students were divided into small task groups and role played their view of different combinations of the two dimensions.

Day Eighteen: Small group presentation on Selective perception and semantics (descriptions).

Day Nineteen: Open discussion centering on comments from journals.

Day Twenty: Small Group Presentation. Game playing. Using games like Monopoly, Risk, Poker, etc., as analogous to real interpersonal relationship.

Day Twenty-One: Sex Role Stereotyping: Students role played opposite sex roles, pull out.

Day Twenty-Two: Group Presentation, Role playing. Life boat Survival, pull out.

Day Twenty-Three: Nonverbal discrimination exercise, Card Game. Students were to determine color and number of their card by

viewing the nonverbal cues of others. In this exercise, each person is given a playing card and a rubber band. Without looking at the card, they are to place it on their forehead with the rubber band. The rules of the game are that any black card is better than any red card, and kings are highest with aces lowest. Thus a black king is the highest possible card, and a red ace the lowest. Thirty minutes of verbal and nonverbal interaction follow, with students instructed to react to the card each person has. Following the exercise persons are asked to guess the color and number of their card.

Day Twenty-Four: Group Presentation on Trust, Nonverbal Trust exercises, Trustfall, and Blind walk, pull out.

Day Twenty-Five: Pictures taken at the Baseball game (played between two of the 110 classes) shown to class. Data collected from class for an experiment.

Day Twenty-Six: Interpersonal Conflict Styles. Role playing conflict situations using both constructive and destructive styles.

Day Twenty-Seven: "Gifts". Group bragging. Here students in the final session are required to tell the other members of the group the three things they like best about themselves, then other students can add any comments they wish to.

Group 2.

Day One: Name Game, (see Day One above), Personal Responsibility exercise. Here students are required to divide up into "Teams" that

attempt to beat other teams at the physical task of holding their arms extended. The pull out is aimed at forcing students to realize they are responsible for their own behavior in the 110 class, and that means making many decisions for themselves.

Day Two: Introduction Triads. The class is divided into groups of three who after a 15 minute discussion are required to introduce each other to the entire group.

Day Three: The class was divided into small groups and then instructed to come up with a definition of communication, and some way to role play this definition to the remainder of the class.

Day Four: The "How well do you Communicate" exercise from Adler and Towne (p. 12) was supposed to have been completed outside of class. A discussion of what students learned by doing the exercise was conducted.

Day Five: Each person was instructed to come up with eight adjectives, or roles that described him/herself. These were then shared with other students in small groups. Pull out, difficulty of limiting self to only eight characteristics, or difficulty of coming up with all eight.

Day Six: Class divided into task groups (See Class 1 Day Six).

Day Seven: Inference Observation. (See Group 1, Day Ten).

Day Eight: Dyadic Encounter. (See Group 1, Day Two).

Day Nine: Pullout on Dyadic Encounter. (See Group 1, Day Three).

Day Ten: Nonverbal Trust exercises. Trust Fall and Body passing. (See Group 1, Day Twenty-Four).

Day Eleven: Discussion of defense mechanisms, and how they hinder development of trust and other aspects of interpersonal relationships appears similar to Group 1, Day Nine.

Day Twelve: Continuation of previous discussion on defense mechanisms, with addition of concept of feedback, and how it can sometimes cause defensive reactions.

Day Thirteen: In-class time for task groups to work on class presentations.

Day Fourteen: First Group Project.

Day Fifteen: Class party, planned by the student used to continue breakdown of barriers.

Day Sixteen: Open discussion. (See Group 1, Day Sixteen).

Day Seventeen: Repeat of Name Game to remind all students part of larger group. Worked on "personal profiles" (a positive description of personal characteristics written out, and then passed to other members of the class).

Day Eighteen: The instructor was sick, class met in the Copper Commons (University Center Cafeteria).

Day Nineteen: Research gathered on conflict styles. Pull out.

Day Twenty-Two: Remaining Group Projects.

Day Twenty-three-Twenty-four: Conflict management and styles. (See Group 1, Day Twenty-six).

Day Twenty-Five: Final Group Project.

Day Twenty-Six: Group Bragging, "Gifts". (See Group 1, Day Twenty-seven).

Day Twenty-Seven: Course summary, with overall evaluation.

Group 3.

Day One: Class orientation/Name Game. (See Group 1 and 2, Day one).

Day Two: Introduction Triads. (See Group 2, Day Two).

Day Three: Students in class took the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI). (See Group 1, Day Two). Pull out.

Day Four: Eight characteristics and adjectives. (See Group 2, Day Five). Pullout.

Day Five: Define and Role play the Term Communication. (See Group 2, Day Three). Pullout.

Day Six: Dyadic Encounter. (See Group 1, Day Two and Group 1, Day Eight).

Day Seven: Completion and Pullout of Dyadic Encounter.

Day Eight: Research. Data collected for another person's Thesis.

Day Nine: Sound-off developed into a full period discussion of Social Norms and Sex Roles and differences between cultures.

Day Ten: Color your Personality. Students were given color crayons and large sheets of paper and instructed to draw their public selves, and private selves, and these were then shared with other members of the class in small groups. (See Group 1, Day Five).

Day Eleven: Importance of Nonverbal Communication Trust fall, People passing, blindwalk. (See Group 1, Day Twenty-four, Group 2, Day Ten). Pullout.

Day Twelve: Volleyball and Beer with another 110 class on Blue Mountain.

Day Thirteen: Beginning of class work on Perception.

- (1) Selective Perception, Use of Johnson's three faces.
- (2) Dog and Pony Show: Materials and Exercises taken from Wilmot, Baxter, and Pettersen in their communication workshop for Staff members at Montana State Hospital at Warm Springs, winter, 1976. This included optical illusions, minimum information problems and inference observation (See Group 1, Day Ten, Group 1, Day Seven). Pullout.

Day Fourteen: Eye of the Beholder. Pullout on Selective perception Accuracy.

Day Fifteen: Perception of self, compared to perception of others. (Similar to Group 1, Day Eleven). Here each student was instructed to put his/her name at the top of a blank sheet of paper, and then everyone else in the class had an opportunity to anonymously provide feedback to the persons. This process was continued for an hour. In the second hour, students were divided into small groups, and asked to discuss their reaction to others' comments. That is, which comments did they like best? Why? Which liked worse? Why? Which were probably most accurate? Why?

Day Sixteen: Seeing the world through others eyes. Perception of Discrimination. Nonverbal card game. (See Group 1, Day Twenty-Three).

Day Seventeen: Perception Sets and Competition. Prisoners Dilemma is a forced choice game that almost always produces competition rather than cooperation between groups, even though the only way to "successful" completion of the game is through cooperative strategies. (See for example Shelling, 1960).

Day Eighteen: First Small Group Presentation: Sexuality.

Day Nineteen: Baseball game with another Section of INCO 110.

Day Twenty: Conflict Styles, conflict management and sex differences. (See Group 1, Day Twenty-six, Group 2, Day Nineteen).

Day Twenty-One: Group Presentation - Return to Spontaneity. (Children's games can be fun for adults).

Day Twenty-Two: Group presentation. Importance of Music.

Day Twenty-Three: Class Dinner. (Group Project).

Day Twenty-Four: Research. Data collected for another person's thesis.

Day Twenty-Five: Write yourself a letter. Each student was instructed to write a letter to his/her self which would then be mailed to them a year after the class. Following this first part of the exercise the class was divided up into small groups and in these groups, students had an opportunity to share their messages for themselves with other students.

Day Twenty-Six: Super me. In this exercise, students are instructed to think of the three earliest successes they've ever had. Their three greatest successes during High School, and their three greatest

successes in the past year. These were then written on one side of a sheet of paper. On the back, each person drew a large circle with a small circle inside it. In the small circle each person wrote Super me (Their name). Then in small groups, each student shared his successes. Feedback to these successes was provided to the student by the other members of the class who wrote comments on masking tape and then put these small pieces of tape in the large circle. Pullout.

Day Twenty-seven: Group Bragging, "Gifts". (See Group 1, Day Twenty-seven and Group 2, Day Twenty-six).

APPENDIX 2

Interpersonal Communication 111 Activities

Students in the Interpersonal Communication 111 course participated in activities designed to improve their public speaking ability. All sections used the same text, *Communicating With an Audience. Introductory Exercises*, by Polsin (1974). Students were required to complete nine different assignments spread across 27 days. A description of these nine assignments follows.

1. Assessment of self as a communicator. Students are required to perform an activity designed to show how difficult accuracy of communication of even simple ideas is.
2. Narrowing the scope of the message. In this assignment students were required to come up with a topic for a public speech, and to give ideas about how to approach the topic, as well as a strategy to research it.
3. Outlining ideas for speaker clarity. Students were required to present an outline of the research and other information presented in assignment 2.
4. Adapting the topic to the audience. Students were assigned to evaluate the interests of their audience, and then to deliver a three minute speech to small groups of other class students from the topic research outlines of assignment 3.

5. Clarifying a message for your audience. Each student was required to deliver a 5 minute speech to the entire class, and to obtain feedback on this speech from the other students, and the class inventory.

6. Developing a tool for measuring audience understanding. Each student was required to develop a test over a speech he was to give.

7. An Informative Speech. Application of all previous course content to a novel public speaking situation.

8. Assessment of the public speaking experience: An evaluation. The students were required to evaluate their ability to provide information, assess personal feelings about the situation, their credibility, and to come up with other ideas about speaking methods.

9. 8 to 10 minute speech. Students were required to present and evaluate the effects of their final 8 to 10 minute speech.

APPENDIX 3

Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventories

- R 1. He respects me.
- E 2. He tries to see things through my eyes.
- C 3. He pretends that he likes me or understands me more than he really does.
- U 4. His interest in me depends partly on what I am talking to him about.
- W 5. He is willing to tell me his own thoughts and feelings when he is sure that I really want to know them.
- R 6. He disapproves of me.
- E 7. He understands my words but not the way I feel.
- C 8. What he says to me never conflicts with what he thinks or feels.
- U 9. He always responds to me with warmth and interest -- or always with coldness and disinterest.
- W 10. He tells me his opinions or feelings more than I really want to know them.
- R 11. He is curious about "the way I tick" but not really interested in me as a person.
- E 12. He is interested in knowing what my experiences mean to me.
- C 13. He is disturbed whenever I talk about or ask about certain things.
- U 14. His feeling toward me does not depend on how I am feeling toward myself.
- W 15. He prefers to talk only about me and not at all about him.
- R 16. He likes seeing me.

- E 17. He nearly always knows exactly what I mean.
- C 18. I feel that he has unspoken feelings or concerns that are getting in the way of our relationships.
- U 19. His attitude toward me depends partly on how I am feeling about myself.
- W 20. He will freely tell me his own thoughts and feelings when I want to know them.
- R 21. He is indifferent to me.
- E 22. At times he jumps to the conclusion that I feel more strongly or more concerned about something than I actually do.
- C 23. He behaves just the way he is in our relationship.
- U 24. Sometimes he responds to me in a more positive and friendly way than he does at other times.
- W 25. He says more about himself than I am really interested to hear.
- R 26. He appreciates me.
- E 27. Sometimes he thinks that I feel a certain way because he feels that way.
- C 28. I do not think he hides anything from himself that he feels with me.
- U 29. He likes me in some ways and dislikes me in others.
- W 30. He adopts a role that makes it hard for me to know what he is like as a person.
- R 31. He is friendly and warm toward me.
- E 32. He understands me.
- U 33. If I feel negatively toward him he responds negatively to me.
- W 34. He tells me what he thinks about me whether I want to know or not.

- R 35. He cares about me.
- E 36. His own attitudes toward some of the things I say, or do, stop him from really understanding me.
- C 37. He does not avoid anything that is important for our relationship.
- U 38. Whether I am expressing "good" feelings or "bad" ones seems to make no difference to how positively -- or negatively -- he feels toward me.
- W 39. He is unconformable when I ask him something about himself.
- R 40. He feels that I am dull and uninteresting.
- E 41. He understands what I say from a detached, objective point of view.
- C 42. I feel that I can trust him to be honest with me.
- U 43. Sometimes he is warmly responsive to me, at other times cold, or disapproving.
- W 44. He expresses ideas or feelings of his own that I am not really interested in.
- R 45. He is interested in me.
- E 46. He appreciates what my experiences feel like to me.
- C 47. He is secure and comfortable in our relationship.
- U 48. Depending on his mood, he sometimes responds to me with quite a lot more warmth and interest than he does at other times.
- W 49. He wants to say as little as possible about his own thoughts and feelings.
- R 50. He just tolerates me.
- C 51. He is playing a role with me.
- U 52. He is equally appreciative -- or equally unappreciative -- of me whatever I am telling him about myself.

- W 53. His own feelings and thoughts are always available to me, but never imposed on me.
- R 54. He does not really care what happens to me.
- E 55. He does not realize how strongly I feel about some of the things we discuss.
- C 56. There are times when I feel that his outward response is quite different from his inner reaction to me.
- U 57. His general feeling toward me varies considerably.
- W 58. He is willing for me to use our time to get to know him better, if or when I want to.
- R 59. He seems to really value me.
- E 60. He responds to me mechanically.
- C 61. I don't think that he is being honest with himself about the way he feels toward me.
- U 62. Whether I like or dislike myself makes no difference to the way he feels toward me.
- W 63. He is more interested in expressing and communicating himself than in knowing and understanding me.
- R 64. He dislikes me.
- C 65. I feel that he is being genuine with me.
- U 66. Sometimes he responds quite positively to me, at other times he seems indifferent.
- W 67. He is unwilling to tell me how he feels about me.
- R 68. He is impatient with me.
- C 69. Sometimes he is not at all comfortable but we go on, outwardly ignoring it.
- U 70. He likes me better when I behave in some ways than he does when I behave in others.
- W 71. He is willing to tell me his actual response to anything I say or do.

- R 72. He feels deep affection for me.
- R 73. He usually understands all of what I say to him.
- C 74. He does not try to mislead me about his own thoughts or feelings.
- U 75. Whether I feel fine or feel awful makes no difference to how warmly and appreciatively -- or how coldly and unappreciatively -- he feels toward me.
- W 76. He tends to evade any attempt that I make to get to know him better.
- R 77. He regards me as a disagreeable person.
- C 78. What he says gives a false impression of his total reaction to me.
- U 79. I can be very critical of him or very appreciative of him without it changing his feeling toward me.
- R 80. At times he feels contempt for me.
- E 81. When I do not say what I mean at all clearly he still understands me.
- C 82. He tries to avoid telling me anything that might upset me.
- U 83. His general feeling toward me (of liking, respect, dislike, trust, criticism, anger, etc.) reflects the way that I am feeling toward him.
- E 84. He tries to understand me from his own point of view.
- E 85. He can be deeply and fully aware of my most painful feelings without being distressed or burdened by them himself.

- R 1. She respects me.
- E 2. She tries to see things through my eyes.
- C 3. She pretends that she likes me or understands me more than she really does.
- U 4. Her interest in me depends partly on what I am talking to her about.
- W 5. She is willing to tell me her own thoughts and feelings when she is sure that I really want to know them.
- R 6. She disapproves of me.
- E 7. She understands my words but not the way I feel.
- C 8. What she says to me never conflicts with what she thinks or feels.
- U 9. She always responds to me with warmth and interest -- or always with coldness and dishonesty.
- W 10. She tells me her opinions or feelings more than I really want to know them.
- R 11. She is curious about "the way I tick", but not really interested in me as a person.
- E 12. She is interested in knowing what my experiences mean to me.
- C 13. She is disturbed whenever I talk about or ask about certain things.
- U 14. Her feeling toward me does not depend on how I am feeling toward myself.
- W 15. She prefers to talk only about me and not at all about her.
- R 16. She likes seeing me.
- E 17. She nearly always knows exactly what I mean.
- C 18. I feel that she has unspoken feelings or concerns that are getting in the way of our relationship.

- U 19. Her attitude toward me depends partly on how I am feeling about myself.
- W 20. She will freely tell me her own thoughts and feelings when I want to know them.
- R 21. She is indifferent to me.
- E 22. At times she jumps to the conclusion that I feel more strongly or more concerned about something than I actually do.
- C 23. She behaves just the way she is in our relationship.
- U 24. Sometimes she responds to me in a more positive and friendly way than she does at other times.
- W 25. She says more about herself than I am really interested to hear.
- R 26. She appreciates me.
- E 27. Sometimes she thinks that I feel a certain way because she feels that way.
- C 28. I do not think she hides anything from herself that she feels with me.
- U 29. She likes me in some ways and dislikes me in others.
- W 30. She adopts a role that makes it hard for me to know what she is like as a person.
- R 31. She is friendly and warm toward me.
- E 32. She understands me.
- U 33. If I feel negatively toward her she responds negatively to me.
- W 34. She tells me what she thinks about me whether I want to know it or not.
- R 35. She cares about me.
- E 36. Her own attitudes toward some of the things I say, or do, stop her from really understanding me.

- C 37. She does not avoid anything that is important for our relationship.
- U 38. Whether I am expressing "good" feelings or "bad" ones seems to make no difference to how positively -- or negatively -- she feels toward me.
- W 39. She is uncomfortable when I ask her something about herself.
- R 40. She feels that I am dull and uninteresting.
- E 41. She understands what I say from a detached, objective point of view.
- C 42. I feel that I can trust her to be honest with me.
- U 43. Sometimes she is warmly responsive to me, at other times cold, or disapproving.
- W 44. She expresses ideas or feelings of her own that I am not really interested in.
- R 45. She is interested in me.
- E 46. She appreciates what my experiences feel like to me.
- C 47. She is secure and comfortable in our relationship.
- U 48. Depending on her mood, she sometimes responds to me with quite a lot more warmth and interest than she does at other times.
- W 49. She wants to say as little as possible about her own thoughts and feelings.
- R 50. She just tolerates me.
- C 51. She is playing role with me.
- U 52. She is equally appreciative -- or equally unappreciative -- of me whatever I am telling her about myself.
- W 53. Her own feelings and thoughts are always available to me, but never imposed on me.
- R 54. She does not really care what happens to me.

- E 55. She does not realize how strongly I feel about some of the things we discuss.
- C 56. There are times when I feel that her outward response is quite different from her inner reactions to me.
- U 57. Her general feeling toward me varies considerably.
- W 58. She is willing for me to use out time to get to know her better, if or when I want to.
- R 59. She seems to really value me.
- E 60. She responds to me mechanically.
- C 61. I don't think that she is being honest with herself about the way she feels toward me.
- U 62. Whether I like or dislike myself makes no difference to the way she feels toward me.
- W 63. She is more interested in expression and communicating herself than in knowing and understanding me.
- R 64. She dislikes me.
- C 65. I feel that she is being genuine with me.
- U 66. Sometimes she responds quite positively to me, at other times she seems indifferent.
- W 67. She is unwilling to tell me how she feels about me.
- R 68. She is impatient with me.
- C 69. Sometimes she is not at all comfortable but we go on, outwardly ignoring it.
- U 70. She likes me better when I behave in some ways than she does when I behave in others.
- W 71. She is willing to tell me her actual response to anything I say or do.
- R 72. She feels deep affection for me.
- E 73. She usually understands all of what I say to her.

- C 74. She does not try to mislead me about her own thoughts or feelings.
- U 75. Whether I feel fine or feel awful makes no difference to how warmly and appreciatively -- or coldly and appreciatively -- she feels toward me.
- W 76. She tends to evade any attempt that I make to get to know her better.
- R 77. She regards me as a disagreeable person.
- C 78. What she says gives a false impression of her total reaction to me.
- U 79. I can be very critical of her or very appreciative of her without it changing her feelings toward me.
- R 80. At times she feels contempt for me.
- E 81. When I do not say what I mean at all clearly she still understands me.
- C 82. She tries to avoid telling me anything that might upset me.
- E 83. Her general feeling toward me (of liking, respect, dislike, trust, criticism, anger, etc.) reflects the way that I am feeling toward her.
- E 84. She tries to understand me from her own point of view.
85. She can be deeply and fully aware of my most painful feelings without being distressed or burdened by them herself.

APPENDIX 4

Experimenter Modified Relationship Inventories

- R 1. She thinks I respect her.
- E 2. She believes I try to see things through her eyes.
- C 3. She thinks I pretend to like and understand her more than I really do.
- U 4. She thinks my interest in her depends partly on what she is talking about.
- W 5. She believes I'm willing to tell her my own thoughts and feelings when I think she really wants to know them.
- R 6. She thinks I disapprove of her.
- E 7. She thinks I understand her words but not how she feels.
- C 8. She thinks what I say to her never conflicts with what I feel.
- U 9. She thinks I always respond to her with warmth and interest or always with coldness and disinterest.
- W 10. She thinks I tell her my opinion or feelings more than she really wants to know them.
- R 11. She thinks I am curious about "the way she ticks" but that I am not really interested in her as a person.
- E 12. She believes I am interested in knowing what her experiences mean to her.
- C 13. She thinks I am disturbed whenever she talks about or asks about certain things.
- U 14. She thinks my feelings toward her to not depend on how she feels toward me.
- W 15. She thinks I prefer to talk only about her never about myself.
- R 16. She thinks I like seeing her.

- E 17. She believes I nearly always know exactly what she means.
- C 18. She feels I have unspoken feelings of concerns that are getting in the way of our relationship.
- U 19. She thinks my attitude toward her depends partly on how she feels about herself.
- W 20. She feels I will freely tell her my thoughts and feelings when she wants to know them.
- R 21. She believes I am indifferent to her.
- E 22. At times she thinks I jump to the conclusion that she feels more strongly or more concerned about something than she actually does.
- C 23. She believes I behave just the way I am in our relationship.
- U 24. She feels I sometimes respond to her in a more positive friendly way than I do at other times.
- W 25. She really thinks I say more about myself than she really is interested to hear.
- R 26. She believes I appreciate her.
- E 27. Sometimes she believes I think she feels a certain way because I feel that way.
- C 28. She doesn't think I hide any of my feelings with her from myself.
- U 29. She believes I like her in some ways and dislike her in others.
- W 30. She thinks that I adopt a role that makes it hard for her to know what I am like as a person.
- R 31. She believes I am friendly and warm toward her.
- E 32. She thinks I understand her.
- U 33. She thinks if she feels negatively toward me that I respond negatively toward her.

- W 34. She believes I tell her what I think about her whether she wants to know or not.
- R 35. She believes I care about her.
- E 36. She thinks my attitudes toward some of the things she says, stop me from really understanding her.
- C 37. She thinks I do not avoid anything that is important to our relationship.
- U 38. She believes that whether she is expressing "good" feelings, or "bad" ones, it seems to make no difference to how positively or negatively I feel toward her. .
- W 39. She feels I am uncomfortable when she asks something about myself.
- R 40. She thinks I feel she is dull and uninteresting.
- E 41. She thinks I understand what she says from a detached and objective point of view.
- C 42. She feels she can trust me to be honest with her.
- U 43. She thinks I am sometimes warmly responsive to her, at other times cold and disapproving.
- W 44. She thinks I express ideas and feelings of my own that she is not interested in.
- R 45. She believes I am interested in her.
- E 46. She feels I appreciate what her feelings feel like to her.
- C 47. She feels I am secure and comfortable in our relationship.
- U 48. She thinks that depending on my mood, I sometimes respond to her with quite a lot more warmth and interest than I do at other times.
- W 49. She believes I want to say as little as possible about my own thoughts and feelings.

- R 50. She feels I just tolerate her.
- C 51. She believes I am playing a role with her.
- U 52. She thinks I am equally appreciative--or equally unappreciative--of whatever she is telling me about.
- W 53. She thinks my own feelings and thoughts are always available to her but never imposed on her.
- R 54. She feels I don't really care what happens to her.
- E 55. She thinks I don't realize how strongly she feels about some of the things we discuss.
- C 56. There are times when she feels that my outward response is quite different from my inner reactions to her.
- U 57. She thinks my general feelings toward her vary considerably.
- W 58. She thinks I am willing to use our time to get to know me better if or when she wants to.
- R 59. She thinks I really value her.
- E 60. She thinks I respond to her mechanically.
- C 61. She doesn't think I am being honest with myself about the way I feel toward her.
- U 62. She believes that whether she likes or dislikes herself makes no difference to the way I feel about her.
- W 63. She thinks I am more interested in expression and communicating about myself than in knowing and understanding her.
- R 64. She feels I dislike her.
- C 65. She feels I am being genuine with her.
- U 66. She thinks I sometimes respond quite positively to her, at other times I seem quite indifferent.

- W 67. She thinks I am unwilling to tell her how I feel about her.
- R 68. She thinks I am impatient with her.
- C 69. Sometimes she believes I am not at all comfortable but we go on, outwardly ignoring it.
- U 70. She thinks I like her better when she behaves in some ways than in others.
- W 71. She thinks I am unwilling to tell her my actual response to anything she says.
- R 72. She thinks I feel deep affection for her.
- E 73. She thinks I usually understand all of what she says.
- C 74. She thinks I do not try to mislead her about my own feelings.
- U 75. She believes that whether she feels fine, or awful makes no difference to how warmly and appreciatively-- or how coldly and unappreciatively--I feel toward her.
- W 76. She believes I tend to evade any attempt that she makes to get to know me better.
- R 77. She believes I regard her as a disagreeable person.
- C 78. She thinks what I say gives a false impression of my total reaction to her.
- U 79. She believes she can be very critical of me or very appreciative of me without it changing my feelings toward her.
- R 80. At times she thinks I feel contempt for her.
- E 81. She thinks that when she does not say what she means at all clearly I still understand her.
- C 82. She thinks I try to avoid telling her anything that might upset her.
- U 83. She thinks my general feeling toward her (of liking, respect, dislike, trust, criticism, anger, etc.) reflects the way that she is feeling toward me.

- E 84. She feels I try to understand her from my own point of view.
- E 85. She feels I can be deeply and fully aware of her most painful feelings without being distressed or burdened by them myself.

- R 1. He thinks I respect him.
- E 2. He believes I try to see things through his eyes.
- C 3. He thinks I pretend to like and understand him more than I really do.
- U 4. He thinks my interest in him depends partly on what he is talking about.
- W 5. He believes I'm willing to tell him my own thoughts and feelings when I think he really wants to know them.
- R 6. He thinks I disapprove of him.
- E 7. He thinks I understand his words but not how he feels.
- C 8. He thinks what I say to him never conflicts with what I feel.
- U 9. He thinks I always respond to him with warmth and interest or always with coldness and disinterest.
- W 10. He thinks I tell him my opinion or feelings more than he really wants to know them.
- R 11. He thinks I am curious about the "way he ticks" but that I am not really interested in him as a person.
- E 12. He believes I am interested in knowing what his experiences mean to him.
- C 13. He thinks I am disturbed whenever he talks about or asks about certain things.
- U 14. He thinks my feelings toward him do not depend on he he feels toward me.
- W 15. He thinks I prefer to talk only about him and never about myself.
- R 16. He thinks I like seeing him.
- E 17. He believes I nearly always know exactly what he means.

- C 18. He feels I have unspoken feelings or concerns that are getting in the way of our relationship.
- U 19. He thinks my attitude toward him depends partly on how he sees himself.
- W 20. He feels I will freely tell him my thoughts and feelings when he wants to know them.
- R 21. He believes I am indifferent to him.
- E 22. At times he thinks I jump to the conclusion that he feels more strongly or more concerned about something than he actually does.
- C 23. He believes I behave just the way I am in our relationship.
- U 24. He feels I sometimes respond to him in a more positive friendly way than I do at other times.
- W 25. He really thinks I say more about myself than he really is interested to hear.
- R 26. He believes I appreciate him.
- E 27. Sometimes he believes I think he feels a certain way because I feel that way.
- C 28. He doesn't think I hide any of my feelings with him from myself.
- U 29. He believes I like him in some ways and dislike him in others.
- W 30. He thinks that I adopt a role that makes it hard for him to know what I am like as a person.
- R 31. He believes I am friendly and warm toward him.
- E 32. He thinks I understand him.
- U 33. He thinks if he feels negatively toward me that I respond negatively toward him.
- W 34. He believes I tell him what I think about him whether he wants to know or not.

- R 35. He believes I care about him.
- E 36. He thinks my attitudes toward some of the things he says, stop me from really understanding him.
- C 37. He thinks I do not avoid anything that is important to our relationship.
- U 38. He believes that whether he is expressing "good" feelings, or "bad" ones, it seems to make no difference to how positively or negatively I feel toward him.
- W 39. He feels I am uncomfortable when he asks something about myself.
- R 40. He thinks I feel he is dull and uninteresting.
- E 41. He thinks I understand what he says from a detached and objective point of view.
- C 42. He feels he can trust me to be honest with him.
- U 43. He thinks I am sometimes warmly responsive to him, at other times cold and disapproving.
- W 44. He thinks I express ideas and feelings of my own that he is not interested in.
- R 45. He believes I am interested in him.
- E 46. He believes I am interested in him.
- C 47. He feels I am secure and comfortable in our relationship.
- U 48. He thinks that depending on my mood, I sometimes respond to him with quite a lot more warmth and interest than I do at other times.
- W 49. He believes I want to say as little as possible about my own thoughts and feelings.
- R 50. He feels I just tolerate him.
- C 51. He believes I am playing a role with him.
- U 52. He thinks I am equally appreciative--or equally unappreciative--of him whatever he is telling me about.

- W 53. He thinks my own feelings and thoughts are always available to him but never imposed on him.
- R 54. He feels I don't really care what happens to him.
- E 55. He thinks I don't realize how strongly he feels about some of the things we discuss.
- C 56. There are times when he feels that my outward response is quite different from my inner reactions to him.
- U 57. He thinks my general feelings toward him varies considerably.
- W 58. He thinks I am willing to use our time to get to know me better if or when he wants to.
- R 59. He thinks I really value him.
- E 60. He thinks I respond to him mechanically.
- C 61. He doesn't think I am being homest with myself about the way I feel toward him.
- U 62. He believes that whether he likes or dislikes himself makes no difference to the way I feel about him.
- W 63. He thinks I am more interested in expressing and communicating myself than in knowing and understanding him.
- R 64. He feels I dislike him.
- C 65. He feels I am being genuine with him.
- U 66. He thinks I sometimes respond quite positively to him, at other times I seem indifferent.
- W 67. He thinks I am unwilling to tell him how I feel about him.
- R 68. He thinks I am impatient with him.
- C 69. Sometimes he believes I am not at all comfortable but we go on, outwardly ignoring it.

- U 70. He thinks I like him better when he behaves in some ways than in others.
- W 71. He thinks I am willing to tell him my actual response to anything he says.
- R 72. He thinks I feel deep affection for him.
- E 73. He thinks I usually understand all of what he says.
- C 74. He thinks I do not try to mislead him about my own feelings.
- U 75. He believes that whether he feels fine or awful makes no difference to how warmly and appreciatively--or how coldly and unappreciatively--I feel toward him.
- W 76. He believes I tend to evade any attempt that he makes to get to know me better.
- R 77. He believes I regard him as a disagreeable person.
- C 78. He thinks what I say gives a false impression of my total reaction to him.
- U 79. He believes he can be very critical of me or very appreciative of me without it changing my feelings toward him.
- R 80. At times he thinks I feel contempt for him.
- E 81. He thinks that when he does not say what he means at all clearly I still understand him.
- C 82. He thinks I try to avoid telling him anything that might upset him.
- U 83. He thinks my general feeling toward him (of liking, respect, dislike, trust, criticism, anger, etc.) reflects the way that he is feeling toward me.
- E 84. He feels I try to understand him from my own point of view.
- E 85. He feels I can be deeply and fully aware of his most painful feelings without being distressed or burdened by them myself.

APPENDIX 5

Other Materials

Sign-up Sheet INCO 110

My name is John Cote and I am a graduate student in Inter-personal Communication. I am working on my master's thesis. I'm interested in finding out how this class effects important inter-personal relationships. What I'm doing now is looking for subjects in INCO 110 who might be willing to participate in my experiment. If you were to participate it would require about two hours of your time, and about two hours of a friends time as well. The first hour will be next week outside of class time. The second hour will be during the eighth week of the quarter.

What I will be asking you to do is fill out a questionnaire concerning your relationship with your friend. At the end of the quarter I will schedule a session that you can attend if you wish where I will explain exactly what I have done, why, and what the results are.

There is no need to commit yourself now. Think of a friend of the same sex who might be able and willing to participate as well. Talk it over with them. I will come back at the beginning of next week to see how many people can participate. Thanks for your time.

Your name: _____ Phone: _____

Friend's name: _____ Phone: _____

Sign-up Sheet INCO 111

My name is John Cote and I am a graduate student in Interpersonal Communication. I am working on my master's thesis. I'm interested in finding out how this class effects important interpersonal relationships. What I'm doing now is looking for subjects in INCO 111 who might be willing to participate in my experiment. If you were to participate it would require about two hours of your time, and about two hours of a friends time as well. The first hour will be next week outside of class time. The second hour will be during the eighth week of the quarter.

What I will be asking you to do is fill out a questionnaire concerning your relationship with your friend. At the end of the quarter I will schedule a session that you can attend if you wish where I will explain exactly what I have done, why, and what the results are.

There is no need to commit yourself now. Think of a friend of the same sex who might be able and willing to participate as well. Talk it over with them. I will come back at the beginning of next week to see how many people can participate. Thanks for your time.

Your name: _____ Phone: _____

Friend's name: _____ Phone: _____

Pretest Directions For 110 and 111 Subjects

THANK YOU FOR AGREEING TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY

You have agreed to participate in this experiment, and have suggested the name of another person who is willing to aid as well. We are interested in the kinds of changes which take place in relationships over time. Thus, the other person is being asked to fill out the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory as he/she perceives your relationship. Another area of great interest however, is how accurate interpersonal perception is in important relationships, and does this accuracy of perception change over time as well? In an attempt to answer these questions you are being asked to fill out the following questionnaire. It is a modified version of the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory, similar to the questionnaire being filled out by the other person you have asked to participate in the study.

All information in these questionnaires is totally confidential. You will not be allowed to see the results of the other persons questionnaire, nor will they see yours. If you have any questions you can leave word for me at the INCO departmental office, or call me at 549-0328 or 243-2176. Again, thank you for your participation.

DIRECTIONS: On the following pages, a variety of ways that one person could feel about another person are listed. Please consider each statement with respect to whether you think it is true or not true in your present relationship with the person you asked to participate. Mark each statement in the left margin according to how strongly you feel it is true or not true. PLEASE MARK EVERY ONE. Write in a +1, +2, +3, -1, -2, -3 to stand for the following answers:

+1: I feel that it is probably true or more true than untrue.

+2: I feel it is true.

+3: I strongly feel it is true.

-1: I feel it is probably untrue or more untrue than true.

-2: I feel that it is not true.

-3: I strongly feel that it is not true.

Pretest Directions for Significant Others

THANK YOU FOR AGREEING TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY.

Interpersonal relationships are known to change over time. You have been asked to participate in an experiment by a person with whom you will interact frequently during the quarter. We wish to discover how relationships do change over the period of the quarter. As a result you are being asked to fill out the following questionnaire with regard to the relationship you have with the person who asked you to participate. These questions comprise the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory which has been used frequently to measure the quality of important relationships. Some of the questions may not appear to apply in the relationship in question. However, please try to answer every question as carefully as you can.

All of the information that is obtained from these questionnaires is totally confidential. The person who asked you to participate will not see the questionnaire you filled out. The information will be used in two ways. First, it will be studied to discover the quality of the relationship involved. Second, the other person will be filling out a modified copy of this inventory in which he/she will be attempting to predict how you have filled out this inventory for him/her, to test the accuracy of his/her perception.

If you have any questions you can leave a message for me in the INCO departmental office, or call me at 549-0328, or 243-2176. Again thank you very much for your participation.

DIRECTIONS: On the following pages, a variety of ways that one person could feel about another person are listed. Please consider each statement with respect to whether you think it is true or not true in your present relationship with the person who asked you to participate. Mark each statement in the left margin according to how strongly you feel it is true or not true. PLEASE MARK EVERY ONE. Write in a +1, +2, +3, -1, -2, or -3 to stand for the following answers:

+1: I feel that it is probably true or more true than untrue.

+2: I feel it is true.

+3: I strongly feel that it is true.

-1: I feel it is probably untrue, or more untrue than true.

-2: I feel that it is not true.

-3: I strongly feel that it is not true.

Posttest Directions For 110 and 111 Subjects

THANK YOU FOR AGREEING TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY

The inventory you are completing is the same one you completed at the beginning of the study. We are still interested in looking at the quality of important interpersonal relationships. Over the last five weeks, your relationship with the person you asked to participate may have changed. It may be better, it may be worse. Regardless, try to answer all the questions as accurately as you can, on the basis of your relationship today.

As in the previous questionnaire, all information obtained will be held in strict confidence. The person you have asked will not be allowed to see your responses, nor, will you be allowed to see theirs. The intent of this questionnaire is to see how accurately you perceive the feelings and beliefs of the other person.

If you have any questions regarding either the questionnaire or the experiment, please do not hesitate to contact me. Just leave a note in my mail box in the Interpersonal Communication office.

Did you and your friend discuss the last questionnaire?
YES NO

If yes, what sorts of things were said? _____

DIRECTIONS: On the following pages, a variety of ways that one person could feel about another person are listed. Please consider each statement with respect to whether you think it is true or not true in your present relationship with the person you asked to participate. Mark each statement in the left margin according to how strongly you feel it is true or not true. PLEASE MARK EVERY ONE. Write in a +1, +2, +3, -1, -2, -3, to stand for the following answers:

+1: I feel that it is probably true or more true than untrue.

+2: I feel it is true.

+3: I strongly feel it is true.

- 1: I feel it is probably untrue, or more untrue than true.
- 2: I feel that it is not true.
- 3: I strongly feel that it is not true.

Pretest Directions for Significant Others

THANK YOU FOR AGREEING TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY

The inventory that you are completing is the same one you completed at the beginning of the study. We are still interested in looking at the quality of important interpersonal relationships. Over the last five weeks, your relationship with the person who asked you to participate may have changed. It may be better, it may be worse. Regardless, try to answer all the questions as accurately as you can, on the basis of your relationship today.

As in the previous questionnaire, all information obtained will be held in strict confidence. The person who asked you will not be allowed to see your responses, nor will you be allowed to see theirs. The intent of this questionnaire is to measure your feelings and beliefs about the person who asked you to participate.

If you have any questions regarding either the questionnaire or the experiment, please do not hesitate to contact me. Just leave a note in my mail box in the Interpersonal Communication Office.

Did you and your friend discuss the last questionnaire?
 YES NO

If yes, what sorts of things were said? _____

DIRECTIONS: On the following pages, a variety of ways that one person could feel about another person are listed. Please consider each statement with respect to whether you think it is true or not true in your present relationship with the person who asked you to participate. Mark each statement in the left margin according to how strongly you feel it is true or not true. PLEASE MARK EVERY ONE. Write in a +1, +2, +3, -1, -2, or -3, to stand for the following answers:

+1: I feel that it is probably true or more true than untrue.

+2: I feel it is true.

+3: I strongly feel that it is true.

- 1: I feel it is probably untrue, or more untrue than true.
- 2: I feel that it is not true.
- 3: I strongly feel that it is not true.